Widengren, Geo, 1907–

The ascension of the apostle and the heavenly book (King and Saviour III) Uppsala, Lundequistska bokhandeln [1950]

117 p. 25 cm. (Uppsala universitets årsskrift 1950: 7)

Bibliography: p. [106]–115.

1. Judaism. 2. Mandaeans. 3. Manichaeism. I. Title. II. Title: King and Saviour III. (Series: Uppsala. Universitet. Årsskrift, 1950: 7)

[AS284.U7 1950, no. 7] A 52–10463

Minnesota. Univ. Libr.
for Library of Congress [2]

297
W692

BT
1405
.W5

To O. E. RAVN

Preface

This investigation, in a somewhat expanded form, presents a part of two lectures entitled *Muḥammad, the Apostle of God, and his Ascension*, which were delivered at the University of Copenhagen on May 10 and 12, 1948, on the invitation of its Philosophical Faculty. In that series the Islamic material was presented in the first lecture, the second being reserved for the ideas and ceremonies of the Ancient Near East. In this connection I should like to tender my thanks to the members of the Philosophical Faculty, and especially to Prof. K. Barr and Prof. S. Aa. Pallis.

Mr. Å. Sjöberg, F. K., has checked the quotations from cuneiform texts and Rev. G. E. Björk, B. D., has corrected my English. I beg to offer my sincere thanks to them.

This little book is dedicated to my old teacher in Assyriology, Prof. O. E. Ravn, as a token of friendship and gratitude.

Uppsala, October 1950.

Geo Widengren.

Chapter I

Mesopotamian Religion

Few religious ideas in the Ancient Near East have played a more important rôle than the notion of the Heavenly Tablets, or the Heavenly Book. We know the outlines of its history from old Mesopotamian culture down into Islamic civilization. But one of the most significant features in this history has not been given due consideration, viz., the oft-recurring thought that the Heavenly Book is handed over at the ascension in an interview with a heavenly being, or several heavenly beings, mostly gods (a god). In this monograph we shall treat of this idea in its pre-Islamic, chiefly Israelitic-Jewish surroundings while reserving the treatment of Islamic matters for the future.

We shall in Mesopotamia begin our survey, which is of necessity all too short and rapid.[1] Here we find an interesting text describing the enthronement of the mythical king Enmeduranki, the ancestor of the *bārū*-college.[2]

Enmeduranki, the k[ing of Sippar],
the beloved of Anu, Enlil and Ea,
Shamash into Ebarra[3] [caused him to enter],
Shamash and Adad to their assembly [called him] ...
Shamash and Adad on a great golden throne [placed him],
to inspect oil on water, the secret of Anu, [Enlil and Ea,
they taught him].

---

[1] It is my intention to deal more fully with various problems connected with the subject treated here. This more detailed investigation of Mesopotamian facts must, however, be reserved for the future as, in this case, Mesopotamian conditions only serve as a background of and an introduction to the Israelitic-Jewish material.

[2] For this college, see Haldar, *Associations of Cult-Prophets*, pp. 1 ff., with numerous references to literature. My interpretation of the Enmeduranki text as a scene of enthronement was first presented in *RoB* II/1943, p. 62. For the meaning of the name of Enmeduranki, see Haldar, *op. cit.*, p. 1 n. 4.

[3] For Ebarra, or as we may also read it É-Babbar, see *RLA* II, p. 263.

The tablets of the gods, the bag with the mystery of heaven [and earth],
the cedar staff, the darling of the great gods, they caus[ed his hand to seize].
ZIMMERN, *BBR* p. 116: 1—9.[1]

In order to understand this text, we must remember that Shamash and Adad are the gods of oracle-imparting, who are entreated for oracles and impart such oracle answers. These deities have summoned the primordial king Enmeduranki to their assembly, *puḫru*, in the temple of Ebarra. From the enthronement texts we know that the enthronement of the ruler takes place in the very assembly of gods, *puḫru*, which is convoked in a special chamber of the temple, *ubšukkinnaku*.[2] We assume, accordingly, that the enthronement of Enmeduranki is enacted in this chamber. That we actually have to do with a royal enthronement is at once clear from a comparison with other texts describing the enthronement of the king.[3] Thus far,

[1] For this text see also DHORME, *Choix de textes*, pp. 140 ff.; MEISSNER, *BuA* II, p. 54; *RLA* II, p. 394 f. The text is published also by CRAIG, *ABRT* I Pl. 64.

The text with fairly certain supplements runs as follows:
En-me-dur-an-ki š[ar ālu Sippar^{ki}]
na-ra-am ^{D}A-nim ^{D}En-lil [u ^{D}En-ki]
^{D}Šamaš ina É-barra [u-še-rib-šu]
^{D}Šamaš u ^{D}Adad ana puḫri-šu-nu [im-bi-ú-šu] ...
^{D}Šamaš u ^{D}Adad ^{iṣu}ina kussē ḫurāṣi ú(!)-[še-ši-bu-šu]
šamnē^{meš} ina mē^{meš} na-ṭa-lu ni-ṣir-ti ^{D}A-nim [^{D}En-lil u ^{D}En-ki ū-šal-mi-du-šu(?)]
dup-pi ilāni^{meš} ta-kal-ta pi-riš-ti šamē^{e} [u erṣetim ^{tim}]
^{iṣu} erina n[a-ra]m ilāni^{meš} rabūti ú-š[at-me-ḫu ḳāt-su]

[2] For *ubšukkinnaku*, see Gudea, *Cyl. A* VIII 14 ff., where it is related how Gudea enters *ub-šu-ukkin-na* and entreats the deity who is enthroned there; *VAB* 4, p. 126—127; *Enūma elish* II 114 ff.; JENSEN, *Kosmologie*, pp. 234—243; DHORME, *Les Religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie*, pp. 140—41, 168, 236, 244, 305. The translation of the Sumerian *ub-šu-ukkina(k)* would be something like *tubuḳ ša puḫri* (*paḫāri*), see LANGDON, *The Babylonian Epic of Creation*, p. 142 n. 7, and cf. in *En. el.* the phrase *ukkina šitkunu* (II 18, III 22, 80). For the locality of *ubšukkinnaku*, see the discussions by PALLIS, *The Babylonian Akitu Festival*, pp. 92—100; SCHOTT, *ZA* 40/1931, p. 19. FALKENSTEIN, *Topographie von Uruk*, p. 13; *ZA* N. F. 14/1944, p. 87 n. 2.

[3] Such texts are above all: ZIMMERN, *König Lipit-Ištars Vergöttlichung*, pp. 13: 1 ff.; SCHOLLMEYER, *Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen und Gebete*, p. 36: 70, 40, f., cf. p. 12: 10—14; *VAB* 4, p. 126; *KS* 5, p. 28: 21, 32: 18; *AOTU* I 4, p. 278: 23 ff.; *CT* XV 4; *KS* 5—7, p. 57 Obv.-II; the *myth of Adapa* II 31 f.,

the text offers no special difficulties. The essential feature, however, is that the king together with the cedar staff, the sign of rulership as well as of priestly and magic activities, a symbol of the Tree of Life[1], is given "the tablets of the gods, the bag with the mystery of heaven and earth", *duppi ilāni takāltu pirišti šamē* [*u erṣetim*]. What is meant by this enigmatic expression? The Accadian phrase at once invites to a comparison with similar technical terms. Thus, in a hymn to Ishtar (*KB* VI 2 p. 126: 13), she is spoken to as *gamrāti šipṭa u purussā ūrti erṣetim u šamāmi*, "thou makest complete the judgement and decision of the law of earth and heaven". We should further compare "the tablets of wisdom", *duppi ša nēmēḳi*, mentioned in a passage of the

II 63—65; *IV R*² 25 IV 1—18; *Šurpu* IX 13; *CT* XVIII 26: 64 ff.; cf. *Maḳlū* VII 31—37, and LANGDON, *BL*, p. 36: 4—11. These texts need a rather detailed commentary, which is given in my Swedish work *Konung och Frälsare* (ms. concluded 1946, but still unpublished).

[1] Cf. WIDENGREN, *RoB* II/1943, p. 62—64; *HS* I 3, p. 3 f.; *RoB* V/1946, p. 39, 42, 48, 50. In view of the incontestable royal traits of the figure of Moses as he is presented in tradition (see e. g. PEDERSEN, *Israel* III—IV, p. 662 f. "has in his position features of the king as he was during the prosperous days of the monarchy in Jerusalem"), we cannot doubt that the rod he carries is the ruler's staff. I don't know if Prof. BENTZEN is still sceptical in this point (cf. *Det sakrale Kongedømme*, p. 27 n. 1). He has argued that it is difficult to draw any conclusions from such a late text as *Test. Levi*, because "In this late syncretistic time many ancient mythological conceptions revive". Yes, they do. And the text is admittedly late. Actually it is *so* late that these mythological ideas cannot have come from Babylonian religion which had by now lost all expansive force. But these notions cannot revive out of themselves, they must come from somewhere. And then, because they are still in *Test. Levi* attached to the person of the leader of the people there remains no other source than Israelitic-Jewish royal ideology. In Israelitic-Jewish religion there must have existed many ideas and ceremonies scarcely hinted at in the O. T., and they must have been living enough to find their way into the literature of Hellenistic times. It seems more and more certain that the old picture of early Jewish religion, as drawn by BOUSSET in his *Die Religion des Judentums* (admirable in itself), is absolutely false. In recent times, there has not been any sudden influx of syncretistic oriental notions, these mythic-ritual conceptions on the contrary having been living during the whole history of Israelitic-Jewish religion. For the principal discussion, cf. RIESENFELD, *Jésus transfiguré*, pp. 11 ff. As to *Test. Levi*, we note that we still meet here the elements of the Mesopotamian ritual of enthronement, see *HS* I 3, pp. 1 ff. And to argue only from the late date of a text is surely dangerous as shown by the fact that the Samaritan liturgies contain a ritual whose structure is older than that to be reconstructed from O. T. passages, see *HS* I 3, pp. 12 ff.!

Nergal and Ereshkigal text, where the goddess gives Nergal the following promise:

I shall make thee seize the kingdom on the wide earth,
I shall place the tablets of wisdom in thy hand.
KB VI 1 p. 78: 16—18.[1]

From this passage we are able to conclude that the "tablets of wisdom" are the symbol of sovereignty, i. e. they are identical with the "tablets of destiny", given in the Epic of Creation by Ti'āmat to her consort Kingu. These *dupšīmāti* are the instruments of deciding the fate of the world, as is well known from *Enūma elish*. But this process is repeated annually at the New Year's festival when the assembly of the gods meet in the Chamber of Destiny, and their ruler Marduk decides the fate of the coming year. He has acquired this power by conquering Kingu and destituting him of the tablets of destiny which he fixed on his own breast, in the same manner as Kingu had attached the tablets to his chest (cf. *Enūma elish* IV, 121—122).

From another text we know how this yearly fixing of the Destinies was carried out. In a mythical epic describing the seizing and carrying off of the tablets of destiny it is said of the robber:

He has taken possession of the rulership of the world,
the rulership of the world, the casting of the oracles of lots.
CT XV, Pl. 39: 47—48; cf. *RA* 35/193, p. 14: 1.[2]

---

[1] Text:
lu-še-iṣ-bi-it-ka šar-ru-ta i-na ir-ṣi-e-ti ra-pa-aš-ti
lu-uš-ku-un tu-up-pa ša ni-mi-e-ḳi a-na qá-tiᵗka
Bezold-Budge, *The Tell El-Amarna Tablets*, p. 141, No. 82: 34—36.

We should compare *En. El.* I 156—57 where Ti'āmat hands over the tablets of destiny to her consort Kingu.

[2] Text in *RA* 35/1938, p. 14: 1: *ᴰEn-líl-lú-tam i-te-ki-im na-du-ú pa-ar-ṣu*; in *CT* XV, Pl. 39: 47—48: [*dupšīmātiᵐᵉš*] *ik-šú-da ḳa-tuš-šú* / [*ᴰEn-lil-ú-ta*]*m il-te-ki na-du-ú par-ṣi*; transl. also in Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, p. 124: 47—48. The word *parṣu*, here rendered "oracles of lots", is much discussed, cf. Delitzsch, *HW* 544—45, Weir, *Lexicon of Accadian Prayers* 262, and above all Landsberger, *Archiv für Keilschriftforschung* II, pp. 64 ff., and Witzel, *Festschrift Hommel*, pp. 199—212. The above passage, however, offers no difficulties at all: Zū has taken the tablets of destiny, and for this reason the *parṣu*, in one way or the other, must be identical with them. This is easily explained if we assume for *parṣu* the meaning "lot". The casting of the lots, *parṣu*, gives as an immediate result the assigned lot, the portion, hence what is prescribed, the

The supreme sovereignty of the universe connected with the tablets of destiny is thus identical with the casting of the oracles of lots. The conclusion is then inevitable: the fixing of the Destinies is brought about by casting lots by means of the tablets of destiny. The fate of every year is decided in the assembly of the gods, where the highest god, Marduk, the possessor of these tablets, carries out the casting of oracles of lots, the *nadū parṣē*. We remember that the assembly meets in *ubšukkinnaku* (*VAB* 4 p. 126). Now it is said of this locality:

> Ubshukkinnaku, the place of the oracle-asking of the great gods in Ekur.
>
> Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 241 = IV R², 56, II, 17 f.

This place of the oracle consultation, *šubat šitūlti*, is mentioned also in other texts (e. g. *BA* III, p. 331, VIII, 12—14).

In the Chamber of Destiny, where the oracle consultation, *šitūltu*, takes place, the divine assembly is summoned for fixing the fate by the ruler of the gods, who casts the lots by means of the tablets of destiny. We now understand why these tablets are given various names: the Tablets of Destiny, the Tablets of Wisdom, the Law of Earth and Heaven, the Tablets of the Gods, the Bag with the Mystery of Heaven and Earth. All these names reflect various aspects of these mysterious tablets. They decide the destiny of the Universe, they express the law of the whole world, they contain supreme wisdom, and they are truly the mystery of heaven and earth.

When Enmeduranki is given the tablets of the gods, these tablets are obviously contained in a bag, *takūltu*, a kind of pouch. This manner of carrying the tablets explains how both Kingu

---

divine ordinance. The etymological equivalent of *parṣu*, Arabic فَرْضٌ, shows the same development from "assignment" to "law", "decree", cf. the Qur'ānic use of the root فرض. In this text, *CT* XV 39: 12—13, moreover, *dupšīmāti* in l. 12 is the equivalent of *tērēti ša ilāni* in l. 13. Here this parallelism would be meaningless unless *dupšīmāti*, *tērēti*, and *parṣu*, all of them, denoted the oracular tablets. This very important passage has been missed both by Östborn, *Tora in the Old Testament*, and by Engnell, *Israel and the Law, a Review Article*. Heidel, *op. cit.*, translates *nadū parṣi* "(the power) to issue commands", of course quite impossible, and showing no sense of the technical meaning of this idiomatic expression. Jensen in *KB* VI 1, p. 51: 48 has much better "das Hinwerfen der Gebote". But "Gebote" cannot be thrown, and for this reason we must substitute here the original meaning of *parṣu* as shown in *Additional Note No. 1.*

and Marduk are able to have them attached to their breasts. The word *takāltu* denotes a receptacle of writing materials[1], and we ought to assume that the tablets were written in one way or an other. Actually Marduk, on having taken the *dupšīmāti* from Kingu, first sealed them and then fastened them on his breast (*Enūma elish* IV 121—122). This sealing of the tablets is the regular Mesopotamian procedure of preserving the written document from any modification, it is the manner of making the legal document inviolable.[2] Marduk's sealing of the tablets would thus be meaningless if they were not written. But what was thought to be written on the tablets would seem to be impossible to make out.

At the moment of his enthronement as the mythical ancestor of the *bārū*-college, Enmeduranki is accordingly given three oracular instruments and methods: the inspection of oil on water, handling the cedar staff, and the tablets of destiny. It goes without saying that, on account of their cosmic signification, the tablets are by far the most important.

By means of these three oracular methods king Enmeduranki possesses extraordinary knowledge — in fact he is the possessor of the "bag with the mystery of heaven and earth". This divine wisdom, imparted to the ruler at the occasion of his enthronement, is not any exclusive right only belonging to mythical Enmeduranki. On the contrary! It is a distinctive trait of the Mesopotamian royal ideology that the ruler is endowed by the gods with surpassing knowledge and heavenly wisdom. In a royal hymn he is glorified in the following way:

Enlilbāni, the counsellor, possessor of exceeding knowledge,
the solicitous, thy judgement is secret knowledge,
the holy one, knowing everything.

OECI, I p. 13: 30 ff.[3]

[1] See DEIMEL, *ŠL* 3: 2 p. 466 a; MEISSNER, *BuA* I, p. 259.

[2] See e. g. the use of the word *kunukku*, seal, in the code of Hammurabi, and note that the word *kunukku*, may acquire the sense of "(sealed) document", cf. MEISSNER, *BuA* I, p. 179 f. Note that the book-roll, Rev. 5: 1, is sealed, see LOHMEYER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes, ad. loc.* (Roman practice?).

[3] Text (correcting the transcription and transl. given by LANGDON), *op. cit.* Pl. 10.
^{D}En-lil-ba-ni galga geštú(g)-diri(g) tug
šà(g)-kùš-ù di-zu enim-dib-gál
kù zu-nig-nam-ma.
Cf. *BE XXIX* 4 Rev. 12:
en ^{D}Nin-urta di-zu di-gal-àm
Lord Ninurta, thy judgement is a great judgement.

In another hymn Shulgi is greeted:

He, to whom Enki hath given wisdom, art thou.

OECI I, p. 43, col. II 12.[1]

From a hymn to Lipit Ishtar, very much resembling that to Enlilbani we may quote:

Shepherd, possessing wisdom.

RA 40/1945—46, col. I 22, p. 48, 51.[2]

Lipit Ishtar is further addressed in the following words:

Greatly wise, giving decisions,
leading the country!
Great wisdom,
magnificently knowing everything!

RA 40/1945—46, col. III 11—14, p. 49, 52.[3]

In this connection we should also note the important fact that this wisdom is in a way visualized in the king's being the wise scribe. Thus a hymn says to Shulgi:

The sage scribe of Nidaba art thou.

OECI I, p. 44, col. I, 19.[4]

Against the background of these Sumerian passages we find it easy to understand the claim of Assurbanipal that he was instructed in the art of tablet-writing among many other sciences.[5] As the possessor of exceeding knowledge and wisdom it is quite natural that he should be equipped with such qualities too.

From this type, the king as the wise scribe, we may now turn our attention to another type: the king as the visionary seer.

Especially important is the claim of the last Babylonian king, Nabunā'id, that he is able to behold the hidden things, if we

[1] Text *OECI* I Pl. 40: 12, *geštú(g)-sì(m)-ma* ^{D}*En-kì -kam me- en.*

[2] Text in *TRSL* II no. 87 col. I 22, *sipa(d) igi-gál tug.* Cf. *ib.* col. II 10 *geštú(g) uš,* "gifted with wisdom".

[3] Text in *TRSL* II no. 87 col. III 11—14:

gal zu ka-aš-bar
ka[l]am -e si-sá
geštú(g) dagal
níg-nam gal- li-eš zu

We may also compare such passages as *KS* 5 p. 54: 28; p. 98: 2—4.

[4] Text *OECI* I Pl. 40: 19, *dup-sar gal-zu* ^{D}*Nidaba-kam me-en.* Cf. *TRSL* II no. 87 col. IV 8—9 = *RA* 40/1945—46, p. 48, 52:

Nibru^{ki}-še — In Nippur
d[u]b-sar-ri me- en — thou art a scribe.

[5] See *VAB* 7: 2 p. 357 n. 3 quoted passages, and cf. *MAOG* XI 3/1937 p. 7 = *CT* XV 50: 61—67.

may trust the satirical poem, directed against him from the circle of the Marduk priesthood of Babylon.

I am wise, I am knowing,
I can behold the hid[den].
The imprint with the stylus I do not know,
I behold the mys[tery].
The god Ilteri caused me to see a vision,
everything he sho[wed me].
'The Position in heaven of the New Moon',
which Adapa composed,
this (work) I surpass,
all wisdom is [(collected) with me].

Landsberger & Bauer, *ZA* 37/1926—27, p. 92; Ravn, *BAKHI*, p. 222 f.[1]

It is interesting to note that the wisdom Nabunā'id here claims to have is held by him to surpass even that of the primordial man, Adapa. The comparison returns in an earlier passage in the poem, whose author makes the king exclaim the following concerning an image of a god that he has erected:

The judicious Ea
did not form its likeness,
The wise Adapa
does not know its name.

Landsberger & Bauer, *ZA* 37/1926—27, p. 90; Ravn *op. cit.*, p. 220.[2]

[1] Text according to the readings of Landsberger & Bauer and the translation given by Ravn:

en-ḳi-ik mu-da-a-ka
a-ta-mar ka-[tim-ta]
mi-ḫi-iṣ ḳan dup-pu ul i-di
a-ta-mar ni-[ṣir-ta]
ú-šab-ra-an ^{D}Il-te-ri
kul-lat u-ta-[a-an-ni]
azkaru ^{D}A-nim
ša ik-ṣu-ru A-da-pa
eli-šu šu-tu-ḳa-ak
kal ni-me-ḳu [itti-ia]

For the writing of final vowels see *Additional Note No. 2.* The original editor of this difficult and broken text, S. Smith, has protested against the corrections of his readings and translations as given by Landsberger & Bauer, see his Schweich Lectures 1940, *Isaiah, Chapters XL—LV,* p. 118 f.

[2] Text according to the readings of Landsberger & Bauer and the translation given by Ravn:

In this case the pretensions of Nabunā'id are still more raised. Not only the wise primordial king Adapa does he exceed in wisdom, but also the wisest of gods, Ea himself. The connection between Ea, god of wisdom, and the king recurs, of course, in other texts, e. g. when the Assyrian king Sanherib says:

(Ea) as a counterpart to the wise Adapa presented (to me) a comprehensive wisdom.

LUCKENBILL, *Annals of Sennacherib*, p. 117: 4.[1]

In this case we again find the king pretending to possess a wisdom parallelling Adapa's, a wisdom given him at his birth. Again and again are we brought back to the fact that the Mesopotamian ruler, as the owner of divine knowledge, compares himself with the wise Adapa, whom he either deems his equal or even as his inferior.

We do not here follow the consequences of this divine knowledge with which the king is endowed[2], but pass over to the rôle played by Ea in this connection. In the annals of Sanherib the text speaks of Ea as the bestower of royal wisdom. In this place we may appropriately quote a text where it is said of the king:

Hath he paid heed to the message of Ea,
the great gods will direct him

---

la ip-ti-ḳu ^{D}E-a Mu-um-mu
[pi-tiḳ-šu]
ul i-di zi-kir-šu
ūm-ma-^{D}a-num A-da-pa.

I cannot find that SMITH's argument, *op. cit.*, pp. 118 f., is in any way convincing. We do not possess all Neo-Babylonian texts, and the demand to produce a parallel writing to the artificial writing of *ummānum* is therefore hardly justified. It is enough that such writings do exist, as is admitted even by SMITH, *op. cit.*, p. 118. For Mummu understood as the adjective, see also ALBRIGHT, *JRAS* 1925, p. 295. LANDSBERGER & BAUER, *op. cit.*, refer to *VS* I No. 37 III 4 f. SMITH further argues that there is no room for the restoration *pitiḳtu*. Actually L. & B. propose, *op. cit.*, p. 90 n. 2, *pitiḳšu* for which there ought to be room, eventually on the edge of the tablet, to judge from the copy given by SMITH, *op. cit.*, Pl. VI.

[1] Text:
(^{D}Ea ...) šun-na-at apkalli A-da-pá iš-ru-ka pal-ka-a ḫa-sis-su
LAYARD, *Inscriptions*, Pl. 38 f.

[2] We reserve this theme for future research.

by means of oracle consultation and on the paths of right-
eousness.

CT XV Pl. 50: 7—8; Böhl, *Der babylonische Fürstenspiegel*, p. 8.[1]

The king thus has to pay heed to the message from Ea, the *šipru* of the god, the word "sent" by him. The king is given a message from the god, and his is the task to realize it. The great gods constantly lead the prince by means of oracle-questioning, *šitūltu*, the process we have already mentioned as enacted by the casting of the tablets of destiny (and which, of course, is carried out also through other oracular instruments). By means of oracle consultation, *šitūltu*, the king is led on the paths of righteousness. The ruler is thus guided by the god(s) and fulfils his royal commission with due heed paid to the demands of righteousness. This notion takes us back to the moment of the king's enthronement when he gets his commission, when he is "sent out". Actually when the ruler is enthroned he is entrusted

[1] Text:

a-na ši-pir ^{D}E-a i-ḳúl
ilāni^{meš} rabūti^{meš} i-na ši-tul-ti
u ṭú-da-at mi-šá-ri irteneddū^{me}-šú

Böhl, *op. cit.*, translates *šipir ^{D}Ea*, "die Weisung Ea's", but I have deliberately chosen the word "message" (so also Haldar, *Associations of Cult Prophets*, p. 10) in order to associate with *našparu*, the "messenger", the Sent One; cf. also the *Prism of Esarhaddon* ed. Campbell Thompson, col. II 6—7: *ši-pir maḫ-ḫi-e na-áš-pir-ti ilāni^{meš} u ^{D}Iš-tar ka-a-a-an ú-šad-di-ru-u-ni*, "the message of the inspired, the sending of the gods and Ishtar continuously directed me", where the speaker is the king (Campbell Thompson here translates *šipir maḫḫē*, "the mystery of the seer," but Haldar, *op. cit.*, p. 27, "message"), a very good parallel to our passage. But for *šitūltu*, "decision" (so Weir, *Lexicon* 348, accepted by Haldar, *op. cit.*, p. 10 n. 3) cannot be the primary meaning, for it is the feminine form of the I 2 inf. of *ša'ālu*; hence "asking", "questioning", "consultation", is the original sense, i. e. the consultation of oracles from the gods. Accordingly, we render *šitūltu* "oracle consultation". Obviously the term then passes over to denote not only oracle-asking but also oracle-answering, i. e. the whole process of asking and answering, hence "oracle", "decision be means of oracles". See also the passages quoted above, p. 11, from *IV R*^{2} 56 II 17 f., and *BA* III, p. 331, VIII 12—14. The whole situation alluded to there clearly demonstrates that the gods cast the lots and in this way ask for oracles, good or bad, for the New Year, thus acting in the same manner as the earthly assembly. The meaning argued here has been stated already in Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrisch-Englisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch* II, 1133 b, with a reference also to Delitzsch, *Assyrian Grammar* § 65, 40.

with a commission from the highgod. This motif is found in the mythic epic of Labbu when the god Tishpak declares:

Thou hast *sent* me, o Lord, [to slay (?)] the creature of the river. *CT* XIII, Pl. 33: 23; Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, p. 120: 23.[1]

Here the commisson is a warlike one given to a young, combatant god. But we meet with the same theme in connection with the enthronement of the king in the text of Lipit-Ishtar's divinization.

Anu in his heart chose him for king,
unto the scion of kingship he legitimately proclaimed:
'Lipit-Ishtar, thou art presented by me with force, to *giparru thou mayest arise* ...
Shaping justice for Shumer and Accad, making the condition of the country pleasant,
Lipit-Ishtar, son of Enlil, *like the daylight may go forth resplendent*!'

Zimmern, *Lipit-Ištars Vergöttlichung*, p. 12: 33—35, 38—39.[2]

We note here the choice of the king, the naming by name, the commission and the proceeding.

From the world of mankind we may again return to the mythic sphere of the gods, where we meet with quite a similar situation of enthronement. The scene is the heavenly palace of the highgod, where the old god meets the young one.

Him received the father of the gods,
with illustrious names he named him:
'O thou wazir of thy brothers, the bull of heaven,
thou who by thee keepest the life of the people! ...

[1] Text:

taš-pu-ra-an-ni be-el ri-ḫu-ut ^{D}nāri [a-na da-a-kim (?)]

[2] The important Sumerian expressions are underlined: "thou mayest arise", *ḫe-zi* 1. 35 (*zi* = *tibū*) "like the day(light) may (he) go forth resplendent", *u₄-gim dalla ḫe-ni-è* 1. 39 = *kī ūmi namru lūṣā*, cf. *CT* XV, Pl. 4: 10 *kī ūmi tallakam*, showing that in this place *kī ūmi* has to be translated like *u₄-gim* in the Lipit-Ishtar text (Böhl, *JEOL* 1—5, p. 199 who has not made this comparison has "zoals de storm"). For *ḫe-ni-è* = *lūṣā*, cf. *CT* XV, Pl. 3: 16 *ṣīma*, as an introduction of the commission to the Sent One. Falkenstein, *Arch. Or.* XVII, p. 216: 23, in the hymn to Samsu'iluna has *ḫe-ni-ib-e*: "mögest du deine G[rösse] wie die Sonne strahlend aufgehen lassen". Further Falkenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 216: 50 *u₄-gim mul-mul* = "resplendent like the daylight", and p. 217: 53 *u₄-zalag-ga-gim dalla-è-a-zu-dè* = "When thou arisest resplendent like the shining day(light)." Cf. also *CT* XXXVI Pl. 28: 26.

I have handed over to thee all sanctuaries,
the mortals I have entrusted to thy hand!
In my country thy throne may stand firm,
like the daylight thou mayest proceed!'

CT XV Pl. 4: 1—10; Böhl, *JEOL* 1—5, p. 199.[1]

In this text we note the following ritual stages:

1. Entering the heavenly palace.
2. Reception by the god.
3. Naming with glorious names.
4. Handing over the sovereignty of the world.
5. Promise of the firmness of the rule.
6. Exhortation to proceed like the daylight.

The last ritual motif, as we have seen, is given another form in the Lipit-Ishtar text, where a different scheme was found. There we were instructed as to the real meaning of the proceeding of the king: he gets the message from the highgod, his father, that he has to spread justice and righteousness in his country. He is thus "sent out" on a special commission, entrusted to him at the enthronement. Another form of this *sending out* was the order to the young god to fight the power of chaos, the destructive Labbu. Here the exhortation runs as follows:

Go, Tishpak, slay the Labbu!

CT XIII, Pl. 33: 20; Heidel, *op. cit*, p. 120: 20.[2]

It is not our intention in this article to give a survey of all the ritual motifs of the Mesopotamian enthronement.[3] On the

[1] The calling with names is especially instructive in the "Elevation of Ishtar to Queen of Heaven", *RA* 11/1914, pp. 141 ff., where Ishtar, when acquiring the position of queen of heaven from Anu, is given the following names: "Elevated", "Antu", "Ishtar of the stars", after which she is endowed with the emblems of royalty and assured that Anu hands over to her his elevate decisions, l. 45. Cf. *CT* XXXVI Pl. 30: 34 = *ZA* N. F. 15/1949 p. 112 (Urninurta).

Text in the decisive line 10: *kī ú-mi ta-la-ka-am*. Note how close this expression comes the Sumerian *u₄-gim dalla ḫe-ni-è*, see the preceding note.

[2] Text: *a-lik* ^{D}*Tišpak Lab-bi du-*[*ka-am-ma*].

[3] The ritual motifs in the "ideal" ritual of enthronement may be summed up in the following way:

1. Ascent to heaven.
2. Entering the heavenly palace.
3. Reception by the highgod in his assembly.
4. Purification.
5. Anointing.
6. Communion.
7. Clothing in the royal garments.
8. Handing over of the regalia.
9. Entrusting of world sovereignty.
10. Calling with names of honour.

contrary, we only wish to concentrate ourselves on the few themes of real importance for our investigation. For this reason we wish to emphasize the fact that the Mesopotamian king is really looked upon as the Sent One.[1] As early as in Sumerian inscriptions the king is given such titles denoting his being "sent" by the god. Thus it is said of Lugalzaggisi, the founder of a real Sumerian empire:

> Lugalzaggisi, king of Uruk, king of the country,
> the Sent One of Enlil, king of countries.
> Barton, *RISA*, p. 99, III 3—8; Gadd, *SRB*, p. 109.[2]

The Sumerian expression, *ki(n)-ki(n)-ma*, corresponds to an Accadian *našparu*.[3] Even among the rulers of Eshnunna do we find this title, *našparu*.[4] It has then been in use during all subsequent periods until we strike upon it in an inscription by Nabunā'id

---

11. Initiation into the heavenly secrets.
12. Enthronement on the god-father's throne. 13. Hieros gamos.
14. Sending forth with a message or a commisson.

This pattern, which is, of course, never found in its complete form with all its single elements, is reconstructed from the texts enumerated on p. 18, n. 3.

[1] We have mentioned this fact already in *RoB* II/1943, p. 69 ff.

[2] Text: *lugal-zag-gi-si lugál-unu^{ki}-ga lugal kalam-ma ki(n)-ki(n)-ma ^{D}En-lil lugal kúr-kúr-ra.*

[3] See Deimel, *ŠL* 2: 4, 538, 9 = *šapāru* = send.

[4] Böhl, *op. cit.*, p. 42, directed attention to this text, which deserves quoting.

a-na ^{D}Tišpak	For Tishpak,
be-lí-šu	his lord,
Bi-la-la-ma	Bilalama,
na-ra-am-šu	his beloved,
u na-áš-par-šu	and his Sent One,
išak	ishakku
áš-nun^{ki}	of Eshnunna,
é-sikil-am	E-sikil
ša i-ra-a-mu	which he loves
ib-ni	has built.

OIC 13/1932, p. 45 = *OIP* 43, p. 135, Inser. No. 4.

In this inscription we observe, as in the Enmeduranki text, the royal term "the beloved", *narāmu*, recurring also in Israelitic-Jewish religion, see Dhorme, *La religion assyro-babylonienne*, pp. 164 ff.; Widengren, *Religionens värld*, p. 278. For another text where *našparu* is used of the king in Eshnunna, see *OIP* 43, p. 147, Seal legend No. 19. Böhl, *op. cit.*, p. 42 n. 4, mentioned the inscr. Leiden No. 1301, and refers to *JEOL*, 2, p. 49.

where he describes himself as *našpar lā āneḫi*, "the Sent One who is not weary" (*VAB* 4, p. 234, Nabonid, Nr 3, I 9). Thus both in Sumerian and Accadian inscriptions, the king considers himself the one sent by the god (the god of the country or of the city). Nabunā'id also mentions his being "sent out" by Marduk with a special commission: to guide the country properly, to be a shepherd for the people, to entertain the cult-centres, to renew the temples. Here the technical expression is *rabīš uma'iranni*, "he solemnly sent me", the verb *ma'āru* being used here (*VAB* 4, p. 104: 22 ff.). This trait in the royal ideology, however, has even at an early epoch been occupied by the Ea priests who claim for themselves to be the "messengers" of the god.[1]

From this brief survey we conclude that at his heavenly enthronement the Mesopotamian king is given by the highgod the tablets of destiny, which contain the wisdom and fate of all the universe, and which he must have born attached to his breast like Marduk in the *Enūma elish*. By means of these tablets the fate is decided through casting lots. The king is sent out by the god in the special commission of surveying right and religion, he is the guide of the people, guided himself by the will of the god (gods) communicated to him by means of questioning oracles. By this oracle-consultation the gods impart to him their message whereby he is directed. The king is the possessor of divine knowledge imparted to him especially by the god of wisdom, but also of course as the possessor of the tablets of wisdom. He may

---

[1] Thus the priest says: *be-lum ia-a-ti iš-pu-ra-an-ni.* *IV R*^{2} 17: 40 = Schollmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 46 (misreading *pur* in stead of *pu*) and in the following line: *en gal En-ki-gé má-e mu-un-ši-in-gi-en*, "the great lord Enki has sent me". In the sequel the speaker mentions himself as "the exorciser, thy servant", when addressing himself to his god, Schollmeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 46, Rev. 6. Especially interesting is p. 31, col. II 2, 4, 6:

mār šip-ri ša ^{D}E-a a-na-ku	I am the messenger of Ea.
[a-n]a bul-luṭ a-me-lu mut-tal-li-ki	In order to give life to straying mankind
ia-a-ti iš-pur-ra-an-ni	he hath sent me.
ša ^{D}E-a iš-pur-an-ni ú-ša-an-na-ni	What Ea hath sent me to, he hath announced to me.

This passage has been quoted in Widengren, *Mesopotamian Elements in Manichaeism*, p. 171, where it is shown how the idea expressed here has been living in Syrian Gnostic circles. The promise given, *op. cit.*, p. 171, n. 2, is at least partly fulfilled in the present monograph.

also be called "the sage scribe". The king is the Sent One. He has ascended to heaven to receive, among other things, the tablets of destiny and to get his commission.[1] Then he is sent out, i. e. he descends again. All these mythical ideas have found their expression in ritual performances, rather little of which is known to us.[2]

As to the knowledge communicated to the king, it is of a mysterious character, bearing upon the great mystery of heaven and earth, the hidden things, and is a revelation of the hidden knowledge possessed by the gods (the god). Can we style it "primordial revelation"?

[1] This idea is the background of the saying in a hymn to Ninurta:

e-ne-gim nam-sig-igi-nim-ma tar-tar-re šu-zu-šè ša-mu-u$_8$-gar

Like him to decide the destiny of below (and) above, he has put in thy hand. *CT* XXXVI Pl. 31 (= *VS* X Pl. 145): 16 = *ZA* N. F. 15/1949 p. 114 f.

[2] It is astonishing how little is known of the royal ritual. The most valuable information is won chiefly from the *bīt rimki* texts, to which belong, *inter alia*, the texts published by SCHMOLLMEYER referred to above, p. 8, n. 3.

Chapter II

Israelitic-Jewish Religion in the Light of Comparative Research

Passing from Mesopotamia to Israel, we are at once struck by the coincidence between the complex of mythical ideas and rites as we have just described them, and the rôle played by the leaders of the people, such as Moses, the king, and the prophet.

We start our analysis of the Israelitic-Jewish material by examining the traditions concerning Moses' receiving the tablets of law from Yahweh. While God in Exod. 20: 1 ff. *speaks* the ten commandments to Moses[1], in Exod. 24: 12, he presents him

[1] Some commentators have assumed that this tradition is the oldest layer, see e. g. Gressmann, *Mose und seine Zeit*, p. 190 f. But it would seem that Baentsch, *HAT* I 2, p. 213, is right in identifying 24: 1 f., 9—11 with a very archaic religious conception in Israel (visible appearance of Elohim, eating and drinking on the mountain of God). On the other hand it is quite conceivable that 24: 12 ff., although "overfilled" on account of additions, join the preceding verses and form the natural sequel of the tradition how Moses received from Elohim the tablets of law; compare, for the opinion that the writing by God is contained in the oldest tradition, Jeremias, *Der Gottesberg*, p. 113, and for 24: 1—2, 9—11 Beer, *HZAT* I 3, p. 125 f., 127, who however spoils the impression of the text by deleting ויאכלו and changing וישתו into וישתחוו, here following Riedel and Steuernagel. A pure falsification of the text, quite arbitrarily carried out without any support whatsoever! Not any of the versions differs substantially from *TM*, even if the *LXX*, instead of v. 10 ויחזו את האלהים gives καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ ἱστήκει ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραηλ. This weakening of the original sense is of course easy to explain from the viewpoint of Judaism. But the *LXX* has retained "and they ate and drank", καὶ ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον! The Peshitta likewise: ܘܚܙܘ ܠܐܠܗܐ ܘܐܟܠܘ ܘܫܬܘ. It should not be passed over in silence that Beer's commentary appeared in 1939, and thus is the most "modern" one — a striking proof that exegesis is steadily declining from its high position during the first decades of this century! — To return to the question of the age of the tradition of the handing over of the written tablets, it cannot be denied that, in view of the tenor of vv. 1 f., 9—11, 12 ff., it must be conceded that they belong to the oldest strata of Israelitic traditions in existence from the time before the settlement in Canaan. How far they may have preserved any historical data need not occupy us in this connection.

with the stone tablets, written by his own hand. In agreement with the order of God, Moses, accompanied by Aaron, Nadab, Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel, went up to see God. But only Moses was permitted to appear in the presence of God:

> Moses shall alone approach unto Yahweh, but they (the other) shall not draw near, and the people shall not ascend with him.
>
> Exod. 24: 2.

The inconsistencies and obscurities of the whole narrative need not occupy us because of the limited extent of our present investigation.[1] Suffice it here to see how Moses' acceptation of the law is described by tradition.

> And Yahweh said to Moses: Ascend to me on the mountain and be there in order that I may give thee the tablets of stone and the Law and the commandments, which I have written for their instruction.
>
> Exod. 24: 12.[2]

[1] Even the scholar quite sceptic against the general methods of literary criticism cannot, in these Sinai traditions, deny the existence of a great many different layers. It would be highly desirable that a fresh analysis of the relevant texts could be undertaken, without any presuppositions in either direction. The chief fault with previous research is that it has too much assumed the different traditions everywhere to be "derived from a continuous parallel, independent source" (I take this characterization from PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 734, the last line, where he speaks about "the Crossing of the Red Sea and the Paschal Legend"). As to the relation of the different events I think we must agree with PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 660, when he says, "There is no proper coherence in the whole of this story, and it contains many obscurities which it has been impossible to remove by the various attempts to distinguish between "the sources".

[2] It is not quite clear *where* the story makes Moses meet God. Moses together with the elders are already on the mountain where they have eaten and drunk in the presence of God. Therefore it is impossible to take הלמעלה as denoting direction: it must indicate locality, GESENIUS-KAUTZSCH, *Grammar*, transl. COWLEY, p. 250 d, cf. WRIGHT, *Arab. Grammar*, 3. ed., by ROBERTSON SMITH & DE GOEJE II, p. 191 B. We ought therefore to translate: "Ascend to me on the mountain", i. e. "ascend the mountain to me", this translation implying that God is dwelling on the top of the mountain, which means that the Divinity has the mountain as its seat; the ancient conception of the "Gottesberg" recurring also in O. T. literature, cf. JEREMIAS, *Der Gottesberg* ("panbabylonian"); FRANKFORT, *Cylinder Seals* Pl. XXVII; p. 143, fig. 38; I Enoch XXV 3 (the mountain with the tree of life God's own throne); WENSINCK, *The Navel of the Earth*, pp. 54 ff. *Tree and Bird* p. 32 f.

According to these passages, we here meet with an ascension to God, a meeting between Moses and God and a handing over to Moses of the tablets belonging to God. The coincidence with the Enmeduranki text is striking, and need not be further discussed. Another correspondence may perhaps be found in the curious trait that Moses and the elders eat and drink in the presence and, obviously also, the company of God (Ex. 24: 11). This detail actually reminds us of the banquet of the great gods in *Enūma elish* III, 129—138, when Marduk is chosen as their leader and his destiny fixed, after which he conquers Kingu and Ti'āmat and acquires the *dupšīmāti*. Generally, however, the eating and drinking by Moses and the elders is interpreted as the meal of covenant[1], and it may be that even the oldest stratum of Israelitic tradition attached that significance to this ritual moment. That its original meaning in the pattern must have been something in the same line as in the Babylonian Epic of Creation, however, seems highly probable. But that significance may have been lost when this trait gained its place in the traditions of Moses. Last, but not least, we note that in *Enūma elish* III, 129—138, the idea of a covenant between the assembly of the gods, *puḫur ilāni*, and Marduk, chosen as their leader, is not altogether lacking.[2] Accordingly, this notion does not contradict the ritual significance we should like to assign to the meal in the Exodus tradition.

But now the question arises: Can a setting in life be found for this mythic-ritual motif-complex, or pattern, as it appears here in the traditions of Moses?[3] In other words: Do we know of an

In the O. T. story we find three stages: at the foot of the mountain the people, somewhere on the mountain the elders, and at the top Moses receiving from God the heavenly tablets; cf. BAENTSCH, *op. cit.*, p. 214: "Beachte die etagenförmige Aufstellung: das Volk unten am Berge, Die Priester und Aeltesten auf dem Berge aber nur in halber oder dreiviertel Höhe, Moses ganz oben bei Gott." Nevertheless, BAENTSCH thinks that vv. 12 ff. belong to another layer of tradition ("Traditionsschicht"). Why, is not clear, because they fit excellently into the preceding account.

[1] See BAENTSCH, *op. cit.*, p. 217: "Durch das Mahl vor der Gottheit ist die Gemeinschaft zwischen Gott und dem Volke vollzogen." He furher says of the partakers of the meal that they "angesichts der Gottheit und gewissermassen in Gemeinschaft mit ihr das Bundesmahl halten", p. 216.

[2] The idea of a covenant in Mesopotamian religion ought to be investigated.

[3] For the term "motif", cf. RIESENFELD, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

occasion in Israelitic public life when the tablets of Law were handed over to the leader of the people? Actually we do. In a veritably ancient Hebrew historical text it is said that the "witness" is given to the king at the moment of his coronation. The chief actor is the priest Yehoyada, of whom the text reports:

> He brought out the son of the king and put upon him the diadem and the "testimony", and they made him king and anointed him and clapped their hands and said: (Long) live the king!
>
> II King 11: 12.

The decisive passage runs as follows in Hebrew: ויתן עליו את הנזר ואת העדות. The use of the expression נתן על for both the crown and the "testimony" as objects clearly shows that the "testimony" is a concrete thing that can be placed upon the king much in the same way as the diadem.[1] Since the word עדות, witness, is the synonymous designation of תורה, law[2], we obviously see, from this passage, that a copy of the law was not only given to the ruler, but even attached to him at his coronation. In a previous investigation we have tried to demonstrate, by a comparative analysis supported by both Accadian and West Semitic facts, that the sacral garment of the High priest, including his pectoral with the urim and tummim, was adopted from the king, who had inherited this kind of attire from his Canaanitic predecessors.[3] Here, especially, we wish to stress that these objects, urim and tummim, were borne in a pouch attached

---

[1] See the passages adduced in GESENIUS-BUHL, *Handwörterbuch*, p. 530, 2—c/ e. g. Ex. 29: 6; Jer. 27: 2; 28: 14.

Of course any emendation (ÖSTBORN, *op. cit.*, p. 76, n. 4, gives a survey) would be quite arbitrary, the LXX giving καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἐέζερ (variant reading: τὸ ἔζερ) καὶ τὸ μαρτύριον. This might have been mentioned by ÖSTBORN.

[2] See GESENIUS-BUHL, *op. cit.*, s. v. 2; note especially the correspondance between *duppu adē* and לחת העדת, where the coincidence would have been quite perfect if the Semitic *lē'u* had not been replaced in this expression by the Sumerian loan-word *duppu*.

[3] See WIDENGREN, *Psalm 110*, pp. 13—20. Here, however, we must revise the translation of the RS text given there, Anat III 1—2, where we relied too much on GASTER (not always the safest guide in matters Ugaritic, as is well known!). But it seems that the dominating idea of GASTER's, as to the meaning of this passage, could be retained.

to the breast, exactly as the tablets of destiny were contained in the *takāltu* which, as we have seen, was fastened to the chest.[1]

In "Inanna's Descent to the Nether World" we find some interesting facts to be observed. First we note the statement that the goddess fastened the seven divine decrees onto her, this detail being mentioned when the poet describes how the deity puts on her royal garment including also the breastplate:

> The seven divine decrees she fastened at the side,
> She sought out the divine decrees, placed them at her hand. ...
> Small lapis lazuli stones she tied about her neck,
> Sparkling ... stones she fastened to her breast, ...
> A ... breastplate she bound about her breast,
> All the garment of ladyship she arranged about her body,
> ... ointment she put on her face.

KRAMER, *Sumerian Mythology*, p. 88 (transl.), *Sumerian Literature*, p. 297 (text).

In this text we thus see the goddess provide herself with the "seven decrees".

The number seven together with the decrees recurs again in the same text, when the death of Inanna is described. Here we get to know that the queen of the nether regions, Ereshkigal, sits down on the throne, whereupon judgement is pronounced by the seven Annunaki:

> The pure Ereshkigal seated herself upon her throne,
> The Anunnaki, the seven judges, pronounced judgement before her.

KRAMER, *Sumerian Mythology*, p. 118 f.

Unfortunately, the parallel Accadian version presents no equivalent. Even in the previous investigation we drew attention to the fact that the urim and tummim were compared to the *dupšīmāti*.[2]

[1] See the treatment in my monograph, *Psalm 110*, pp. 13, 15, 19. My discussion suffered, however, from the fact that the Enmeduranki text was not quoted. In my translation of Ezek. 28: 12 ff. I still retain the equation *taknītu*= *tākn̲īt* (HAUPT, *SBOT ad. loc.*), but I would prefer to render the sentence in the following way: "Thou wast a sealer of the preserved (thing), full of wisdom and accomplished in beauty." The word תכנית would thus refer to the "well-preserved" heavenly tablets, see *op. cit.*, p. 15, n. 2, and cf. the well known Kur'anic expression. See further *Additional Note No. 3.* For the sealing of the Heavenly Tablets, cf. above, p. 12.

[2] See WIDENGREN, *Psalm 110*, p. 19 with n. 3, where a reference to DHORME, *RHR* T. CVIII/1933, p. 129, was given (ought to be pp. 129 ff.).

Our comparison here may perhaps be said to have stressed the similarity in significance and function. It must also be emphasized that the tablets of Law, as well as the urim and tummim, play the same rôle as the tablets of destiny in being the instrument by which the will of the deity is communicated to the leader of the people, be it Moses or the king.[1] The Israelitic leader (the king) is thus guided by oracular consultation much in the same way as the Mesopotamian king by using the *šitūltu*.

The notion of the heavenly tablets takes a considerable place in late Israelitic-Jewish speculation, e. g. in the Book of Jubilees. It has already been pointed out that, in this literature, the heavenly tablets, the direct equivalents of the tablets of destiny, ordinance of law and oracle announcement, judgement and divination are identical quantities from a ritual and mythical point

It is highly important to note that JACOBSEN and FALKENSTEIN now agree that the Sumerian term for the pectoral must be *muš*. The former has drawn attention to tho following interesting passage:

en-e nam-en-šè mùš mu- un ...
nam-lugal-šè mìr- zi mu- un ...

meaning:

As the sign of lordship, the Lord attached to himself the pectoral.
as the sign of royalty, he put on the legitimate tiara.
SEM, 78 III, 15—16.

FALKENSTEIN, *Arch. Or.* XVIII, p. 220 n. 21, has adduced the following passages: *TCL*, XVI 61: 4, *múš-nam-en-na* = "the pectoral of lordship", and *SLTNi*, 61: 6, 8, 10, *gú-za mùš-bi igi-dus*, but at the same time referred to the difficulty exhibited in *HAV* 22, IV 9, where a *múš* would seem to be placed on the head. (May be that *múš* in this place has quite another significance?) When he also says: "Bedenken gegen diese Übersetzung erweckt allerdings die Tatsache dass die bildlichen Darstellungen kein Pektorale zeigen", I think this objection could be met with a reference to the material discussed by me in *Psalm 110*, p. 14 f., a material supplemented in the most wellcome way by the new particulars adduced by FALKENSTEIN and JACOBSEN, but above all by the discovery of a magnificent pectoral, possibly Mannean art of the 9th century B. C. from Ziwiye in Azarbaidjan, south-east of Urmia. This pectoral, at any rate, belongs to the Assyrian sphere of culture as shown *e. g.* by the tree-of-life motif in pure Assyrian style, see *JLN* $^{6}/_{5}$ 1950. For *dudināti*, "breastplates", see *Additional Note No. 4*.

[1] It is striking to note how Moses as judge communicates the divine will by means of oracles, Ex. 18: 12 ff. (for literature, see ÖSTBORN, *op. cit.*, p. 58 n. 5) while the king has the urim and tummim consulted for him, see the passages quoted by PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 223 f., and cf. Num. 27: 21, where the oracles are consulted for the sake of the leader, Joshua. We should observe that the question put forward to Yahweh by David and answered by means of the oracles of urim and tummim is exactly of the same nature as that asked by Assyrian kings in corresponding situations.

of view.[1] As late as in Rōsh Hashshānā, Tosefta I 13, the judgement possesses the character of decision of destiny.[2] It is further important to note the rôle played by the sealing of the judgement. In Rōsh Hashshānā, Tosefta I 13, the text runs: הכל נדונין בראש השנה וגזר דינם מתחתם ביום הכפורים "All people are judged on New Year's Day and their decision is sealed on the Day of Atonement." It has further been pointed out that, in Rev. 5: 1—8, the sealed roll corresponds to the tablets of destiny.[3]

As the king in Israel is originally the possessor of the heavenly tablets, we must ask ourselves if the traditions of Moses' accepting the tablets of Law from Yahweh is not the cultic legend composed as an explanation of the king's receiving the *tōrāh* at his coronation. In many respects Moses has the traits of the ideal sacral king, uniting in his person the three functions of king, priest, and prophet[4], as does Adam according to late Jewish traditions.[5] Thus, the legend of how Moses, the ideal leader of the people, once on Sinai received the tablets of Law from God

---

[1] I quote my own words in *Psalm 110*, p. 20 n. 1. Add a reference to CHARLES, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 91 f., *and* I Enoch 47: 3.

[2] Pointed out even in *Psalm 110*, p. 20 n. 1, where MOWINCKEL, *Psalmenstudien* II, p. 74 f., is referred to.

[3] HOOKE in *The Labyrinth*, p. 229. It must however be noted that the seven seals correspond to the sevenfold sealing of a Roman will and testament see LOHMEYER, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes ad. loc.*, p. 50.

[4] See Philo, *De vita Mosis* II, III 39, § 292: τοιαύτη δὲ καὶ ἡ τελευτὴ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ νομοθέτου καὶ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προφήτου Μωϋσέως. Cf. also Ps. Clement. Rec. I 46, 3. These late statements in reality correspond to the picture given by O. T. traditions. Moses' function as leader of the people needs no commentary; his priestly office clearly emerges from such texts as Ex. 18: 12—27; 24: 4—8, and his prophetic gifts from Ex. 3: 2 ff.; 33: 7—11; Num. 12: 6—8; Deut. 18: 15; 34: 10—12; Hos. 12: 14. Cf. e. g. BUCHANAN GRAY, *Sacrifice*, pp. 200 ff.; GRESSMANN, *Moses*, pp. 162 ff.; PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 148, 190 ff., 402 ff.; FASCHER, Προφήτης, pp. 110 ff. As to Moses as a war leader, it is interesting to observe how his behaviour, Ex. 17: 9 ff. (cf. Joshua in Josh. 8: 18), with its magical aim, is strongly reminiscent of Muhammad in the battle of Badr (cf. BÜHL, *Das Leben Muhammeds*, p. 242, where, strange enough, this comparison is not drawn), obviously a proof of how the magic-religious functions and those warlike merge into each other in the person of the Semitic chieftain.

[5] See MURMELSTEIN, *WZKM* 35/1928, pp. 271 ff.

In this connection, note BEZOLD, *Die Schatzhöhle*, p. 63 = BUDGE, *The Book of the Cave of Treasures*, p. 223.

Himself, serves to explain the fact that the kings after him received the *tōrāh* attached to their breasts. We here find a striking parallel to Enmeduranki's receiving the tablets of the gods, for he is the mythical ancestor of the members of the *bārū*-college, who were the possessors of the oracular instruments, including the tablets of destiny. But, moreover, the *bārū*-priests have obviously usurped Enmeduranki as their ancestor, for his descendants ought to be rulers. The king acting in the Mesopotamian New Year festival as the representative of Marduk[1], and hence in the ritual manipulating the tablets of destiny, ought to have a greater right to claim the possession of these tablets. But evidently the priests had, for regular ritual practice, adopted these tablets from him. In the same manner, the Israelitic priests from a certain epoch claimed descent from Moses, were the possessors of the urim and tummim, and used them as oracular instruments, though in early Israel still at the order of the king.[2]

The handing over by Shamash of the law-code to Khammurabi is surely only a special case, a more secular-juridical interpretation, of the ancient mythical scheme, and it has rightly been compared to Moses' receiving the ten commandments.[3] This comparison is to be retained, but in the light of the Enmeduranki text.

We have seen that the Mesopotamian king claimed the possession of supernatural divine wisdom. The same holds true of the Israelitic king, who has received his knowledge from God Himself. The traditions (late, it is true[4]) of David's instructions

---

[1] See LABAT, *Caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne*, pp. 240 ff. *Le poème babylonien de la création*, p. 60 f.; PALLIS, *op. cit.*, p. 141, 215 f., 264 f.; EBELING, *Tod und Leben* I, p. 33: 25 f.

[2] Descent from Moses: Judges 17: 7—13; 18: 30 with the commentary by BURNEY, *The Book of Judges*, pp. 436 ff., esp. p. 438; cf. also HÖLSCHER in *PW* 12: 2 article "Levi" col. 2171 ff. For priests as possessors of urim and tummim, cf. DHORME, *op. cit.*, p. 129 f.; LODS, *Israël*, p. 512; HALDAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 101, 140, 152, the oracles consulted for the king, cf. HALDAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 140, 154 f., and note especially I Sam. 14: 36 ff.; 23: 9 ff.; 28: 6; 30: 7 f. For the rôle of the king as leader of the oracle-giving priests, I refer to HALDAR, *op. cit.*, pp. 137—144.

[3] See GRESSMANN, *op. cit.*, p. 191.

[4] It is however nowadays more and more acknowledged that the late books, such as Chronicles, contain many independent, valuable traditions, cf. from earlier literature even STEUERNAGEL, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, p. 385: "In einzelnen Fällen können ihre Notizen aus alten, uns nicht erhaltenen

to Solomon concerning the building of the temple contain a very interesting passage.

In everything he has instructed me in a writing from a hand of Yahweh, in all the works of the model.

I Chron. 28: 19.[1]

The king has accordingly been instructed by God by means of a writing from Yahweh's own hand. This heavenly book has thus been shown to him, and in his turn he transmits the exact commandments as to the details of the Temple building. This divine instruction imparted to the king from a heavenly book and aiming at the erection of a sanctuary corresponds perfectly to a similar scene when Gudea, in his dream, receives instructions as to his temple building. In both cases very detailed orders as to these measures and other minutiae are given to the king, and the agreement has even previously been duly noted.[2] But, of course, the Israelitic king possesses divine wisdom not only by reading the heavenly tablets or book, but also — exactly like the Mesopotamian ruler — by receiving direct revelations from his god.[3]

Quellen stammen und vollen Glauben verdienen." Cf. also NOTH, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien,* pp. 110 ff. A concrete proof of the reliability of a fact recorded in Chron., but not in Kings, is the case of "platform" and "laver", ultimately going back to the Sumerian *ki-ur*, the Accadian *kiuru,* see ALBRIGHT, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel,* p. 163 f., 216 with n. 63. Such a *kiyor* is now shown by archaeological evidence to have existed among the Western Semites, see ALBRIGHT, *op. cit.,* pp. 153 and 218 f. with n. 92—94. We may add that the attitude of the chronicler to David is well brought out by WELCH, *The Work of the Chronicler,* p. 68.

[1] The translation of this passage has been much discussed, see *Chronicles* in *ICC* to this passage. The difficulties are partly imaginary as a comparison with the Gudea texts show.

[2] Gudea's dream is described in Cyl. A I 27 ff., translation (not always reliable) BARTON, *RISA,* pp. 205 ff.; for the language cf. FALKENSTEIN, *AnOr* 28/1949. Cf. also, for a translation of the content of the dream, DEIMEL, *Šumerische Grammatik,* p. 77—79, where the text, too, is given.

[3] The Israelitic king possesses the Spirit of Yahweh: 1 Sam. 10: 6; 11: 6; 16: 13 f.; 2 Sam. 23: 1—2; Is. 11: 2 (cf. Psalms of Solomon 17: 43). He receives revelations direct from God: 1 King. 3: 5 ff.; 9: 2, as does very often the Mesopotamian king, see DHORME, *Les religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie,* p. 276, 294. As to the Israelitic king, note also the passage in Prov. 16: 10, quoted by JOHNSON, *The Cultic Prophet,* p. 32. Still among the Maccabees the ruler is inspired by Yahweh's Spirit, the story of John Hyrcanus being especially

It has been observed that Moses, when given his commission, is rightly spoken of as "sent out" by Yahweh (Ex. 3: 13; 4: 28). Especially the first passage is instructive:

> The God of your fathers hath sent me to you (שלחני).

This "sending out" is connected also with the remarkable scene when Ezekiel in the vision of his call receives his prophetical commission. It is important to know that the event is enacted in heaven before the throne of God (Ez. 1: 26—2: 1). The Deity is surrounded by all the heavenly beings. The mythical background here is clearly Babylonian, as has been shown long ago.[1] In the second chapter God speaks to the prophet and gives him his commission, the well-known motif of "sending out". On account of the two central themes of our investigation we must surely emphasize the words spoken by God in this scene:

> O, Son of Man, *I am sending thee* to the sons of Israel.
> Ezek. 2: 3.[2]

Next to this moment of God's address to the prophet, Ezekiel gets his commission, after which follows a scene of peculiar character. Let us listen to the description given by the prophet:

> And I looked, and behold a hand was stretched out towards me,
> and behold, a roll of a book therein.
> And he spread it before me,
> and it was written within and without.
> And there was written in it lamentations, and mourning, and woe.
> And he said to me:
> O, Son of Man, what thou findest here, eat,
> eat this roll, and proceed and proclaim to the house of Israel.

---

instructive in this regard, because he received a *bat kol* direct from God, Josephus, *Antiquitates* XIII 10, 3; see further *Test. Levi* 18: 6, and the commentary by CHARLES, *ad. loc.*, in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Translated.* Furthermore, wisdom is a royal virtue, Wisd. 6: 20 f.; Prov. 8: 15 f.

[1] See DÜRR, *Ezekiels Vision von der Erscheinung Gottes.*

[2] Text: בן אדם שלח אני אותך אל בני ישראל

And I opened my mouth,
and he gave me this roll to eat.

Ezek. 2: 9—3: 2.[1]

The heavenly roll is thus communicated to the prophet after he has received the divine command to be a "Sent One". It is given to him in a special way which reflects the prophet's peculiar psychological experiences[2]; but, anyhow, the heavenly book and its contents are handed over to him. The mythical colour is enhanced by the address to the prophet: Son of Man, this expression obviously having a deep significance because of the long history to be postulated for this term on Canaanitic soil.[3]

The idea that the prophet only predicts what he has read in a heavenly book recurs in the Book of Daniel in an interesting passage where we read:

But I will announce to thee what is inscribed in the Book of Truth.

Dan. 10: 21.

It is generally recognized that this Book of Truth is nothing else than the Heavenly Tablets which we will later meet with in the Ethiopic Book of Enoch.[4]

We may sum up the ritual traits in Ezekiel's vision as they are of considerable interest to both our chief motifs:

1. Introduction before God and the heavenly assembly.
2. Calling by names of honour.
3. Sending out with a commission.
4. Handing over of the heavenly book.

The similarities between the vision of calling in the case of Isaiah and that of Ezekiel have been noted in previous research.

---

[1] Concerning some implications of this text, as to its literary fixation, see WIDENGREN, *Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets*, pp. 74 ff. Note that the promise given on p. 74, n. 3, is partly fulfilled by the publication of the present monograph.

[2] See WIDENGREN, *op. cit.*, pp. 99 ff.

[3] See e. g. WIDENGREN, *RoB* II/1943, p. 59, n. 1, 74. The discussions in SJÖBERG, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch*, pp. 190 ff., miss the essential point: the king-Messiah as Primordial Man. It gives me a special pleasure to state the agreement between me and BENTZEN, *op. cit.*, pp. 76 f., 116 ff.

[4] See also MONTGOMERY, *The Book of Daniel* in *ICC*, p. 418.

For our investigation it is of special importance to observe that Isaiah receives his message and is "sent out" in a vision where he sees Yahweh enthroned in His Temple in Jerusalem (Is. 6). Incidentally we may remember the rôle played by the temple, both in Mesopotamia and in Israel, as the earthly image of a heavenly model and as the cosmic seat of the god, as his throne.[1] Jeremiah is also "sent out" after a visionary meeting with Yahweh. In both these scenes of vocation we must note the two catchwords: send out, שְׁלַח (Is. 6: 8; Jerem. 1: 7) and proceed, הלך, (Is. 6: 9; Jerem. 1: 7). Both these technical expressions recur in the Ezekiel text (Ez. 2: 3—4; 3: 1). I have previously pointed out that Is. 61: 1 ff. belongs to the texts modelled according to the royal pattern.[2] The prophet is the "Sent One", but so — as we have seen — is even Moses, and we can clearly perceive that it is from royal ideology that the prophet has adopted both the idea of "sending out" and the ritual scene of the heavenly investiture where he receives his commission, sometimes the heavenly tablets. No wonder, then, that Jeremiah also claims such royal prerogatives as being chosen by God even before his birth, being consecrated and appointed as a prophet for the peoples (Jerem. 1: 5).[3]

[1] For the temple as the image of a heavenly model, see *The Epic of Creation* (*Enūma elish*), where we meet with the conception of a heavenly temple with an *ubšukkinnaku* corresponding to the earthly sanctuary. When Gudea built his temple, the description was found on a heavenly tablet, Cyl. A V 1—4. As to the heavenly Jerusalem, see BOUSSET, *Die Religion des Judentums* 3rd ed., p. 285; *Die Offenbarung Johannis*, pp. 446 ff.; LOHMEYER, *op. cit.*, p. 167. For the temple as the seat or throne of the deity, see above, p. 23, n. 2.

[2] See WIDENGREN, *RoB* II/1943, p. 70 f.

[3] With this remark I think that we are able to meet some objections. For it has sometimes been pointed out that some royal titles — as e. g. the servant, the chosen etc. — could not be claimed as exclusively royal epithets because they have been used also of prophets. But it ought to be kept in mind that the step from spiritual to temporal authority was quickly taken in the Ancient Near East, as the example of Muhammad sufficiently demonstrates to us. The leader of the prophetical circle enjoys a high reputation and has surely been much glorified by his disciples, as in later times the sheikhs of the darvish orders, cf. PEDERSEN, *op. cit.*, p. 110, "a great lord, like the leaders of the Sufi societies in Islam", and WIDENGREN, *Literary and Psychological Aspects*, p. 96 n. 3, 114 n. 2. It should of course not be denied that in some passages it might be difficult to ascertain whether the royal pattern, as applied to the prophet, really has been taken over from the Israelitic king or possibly existed only as a pattern for such a prophetic leader. Continued research must here afford us with more and more perfect proofs.

Now, in Is. 6: 9 and Ez. 3: 1, we find the imperative exhortation of "proceeding", לך. That this trait is also adopted from the royal pattern, is shown by one of the few existing enthronement texts in the O. T., viz. Ps. 110. Some years ago I argued that here, in v. 3, we must interpret לך as an imperative of הלך.[1] But I did not then find the correct setting in life of this ritual exhortation. The comparison with Is. 6: 9, Jerem. 1: 7, and Ez. 3: 1, on the one hand, and the same imperative formula of the corresponding verb, *alāku*, in the Accadian texts, on the other, makes this hypothesis quite certain.[2] From the Mesopotamian enthrone-

[1] See Widengren, *Psalm 110*, pp. 4, 9 ff. But the translation in Swedish "träd fram" ("come forth") was met with some doubt, see Lindblom, *STK* 18/1942, p. 127. This was due to the fact that I missed the decisive argument, the comparison with corresponding Sumero-Accadian and Israelitic texts. Nevertheless, I was on the right track.

[2] Another important coincidence between the description of the prophetical call and the Accadian texts may be pointed out here. In the epic relating the robbery of the tablets of destiny by Zū, the highgod Anu asks his children, the gods, as to who wants to go and kill Zū:

[a-a]-ú ^{D}Za-a li-nar-ma [Wh]o will slay Zū
[i-na] da-ad-me li-šar-bi šumi-šu and magnify his name [in] the inhabited places.
BA II, p. 467; *CT* XV, Pl. 39: 29—30; Heidel, *The Babylonian Genesis*, p. 123: 29—30.

The situation here is reminiscent of *CT* XV, Pl. 4, quoted above, p. 17 f., but there we obviously meet with another ritual moment, the reception of the victorious divine ruler after his victory. Here again Anu, the father of the gods, as he is called, *CT* XV Pl. 4: 1 (where we surely have to supplement his name), asks his sons in the assembly of the great gods (cf. 4: 37 *i-na pu-ḫur ilāni rabūti*) who is ready to proceed into battle. The same holds true of *CT* XIII, Pl. 33: 17, *man-nu il-lak-ma lab-b*[*i i-da-a-kam-ma*], "Who will go and [slay] the Labbu?" The verb "send" is not used in these cases, but is of course understood. There is however another text where Anu directly asks: "Whom may I send?" For in Maqlū we read:

^{D}A-nim u An-tum iš-pu-ru-in-ni Anu and Antum have sent me (saying):
man-nu lu-uš-pur a-na ^{D}Be-lit ṣēri "Whom may I send to Bēlit ṣēri.
Meier, *Die assyrische Beschwörungsserie Maqlû* I 52—53.

And in the sequel we read the following words:

šap-ra-ku al-lak ʾ-ú-ra-ku a-dib-bu-ub I am sent, I go, I am ordered, I speak,
a-na li-it ^{amēl}kaššāpi-ia u ^{sinnišat}kaššapti-ia Against my sorcerer and my sorceress
^{D}Asari-lú-du$_{10}$ bēl a-ši-pu-ti iš-pur-an-ni Asari-lu-du, the lord of incantation, has sent me.
Meier, *op. cit.*, I, 61—62.

In these two passages we observe that, in the first instance, we meet with an incantation priest who claims to be sent by Anu (and Antum, his consort),

ment and epic texts with their *alik*, or *tallakam*, we have thus been able to advance to the Hebrew texts of the prophet's vocation with their *leḳ*.

From the older Israelitic enthronement texts we may now proceed to the younger. Most interesting, but hitherto rather neglected scenes of enthronement meet us in the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* as well as in *I Enoch* and *II Enoch*. As these texts have been subjected to an examination in a previous investigation, we may content ourselves here by pointing out that the mythical and ritual pattern of the Ancient Near East has been preserved in these texts to a rather astonishing degree.[1] Suffice it here to stress some points which were not especially mentioned by me in this brief treatise. In the *Testamentum Levi* God is thus said to have made Levi a son, a servant, and a priest of His presence. Levi is to kindle the light of knowledge and be like the sun to Israel (*Test. Levi* 4: 2—3). This is confirmed to some degree by God Himself, who says:

> Levi, I have given thee the blessings of the priesthood,
> until I come and sojourn in the midst of Israel.
>
> *Test. Levi* 5: 2.

The commission alluded to in this address of God's to Levi is more clearly expressed in another text where, however, it is the accompanying angel who describes his task:

---

who has asked: "whom may I send?"; the priest must therefore have volunteered to go, even in the same manner as the young god against Zū (Labbu). In the second passage we find another priest who pretends to be sent by the god Asari-lu-du$_{10}$, the lord of incantation, and who says: "I am sent, I go; I am ordered, I speak." Here it is especially important to note the use of our two well-known verbs *šapāru* and *alāku* in the expression *šaprāku allak*. Our previous contention that these verbs closely correspond to each other is thus confirmed. Lastly we may add that these passages furnish us with a clear insight into the process whereby religious texts and motifs are taken over and utilized in purely magic texts.

Even TALLQVIST, in his editio princeps of the Maqlū series, has noted the striking coincidence with Is. 6: 8; se TALLQVIST, *Die assyrische Beschwörungsserie Maqlū*, p. 121, But only the fitting of the Maqlū passages into the whole scheme presented here, and especially the observation of the meaning of the verbs *šapāru*, *alāku* in Accadian, as well as of *šālaḥ*, *hālaḳ* in Hebrew, provides us with the right clue of understanding that the coincidence alluded to by TALLQVIST is not of a fortuitous character, but has a deep significance.

[1] See WIDENGREN, *HS* I 3, pp. 1—12.

Thou shalt stand near the Lord,
and shalt be his minister,
and shalt declare his mysteries to men,
and shalt proclaim the redemption of Israel.
Test. Levi 2: 10.

Although this proclamation is not, as the setting in life would properly require, spoken by God Himself, the essential trait, the sending forth with a commission, the message from God, is here preserved. After his heavenly enthronement, Levi has to descend, and carry out the command given him at the very moment of his investiture with the royal garment: "Henceforth become a priest of the Lord ..." (*Test. Levi* 8: 4)! No book is given to Levi, according to this *Test. Levi*. Its place, phenomenologically speaking, is taken by the "breastplate of understanding", for this was a sort of bag, worn on the breast of the high priest (originally the king) and containing the urim and tummim, the equivalents of the tablets given to Moses and also of the Mesopotamian *dupšīmāti*, the tablets of destiny.[1] Moreover, since — as we have seen in the course of this investigation — the heavenly book is only the external sign of initiation into the heavenly secrets, it may of course be sufficient to mention this partaking of the divine knowledge, which is actually the case both in *Test. Levi* and *I* and *II Enoch*.[2] The problem as to why, in some texts, mention is made of the handing over of a heavenly scripture, in others not, will not occupy us in this monograph, its treatment being reserved for another occasion.

A supplementary trait is attained especially in the *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, where Enoch, in the description of his initiation into the heavenly secrets, is allowed, or rather ordered to read the heavenly tablets (the speaker is the angel Uriel):

And he said unto me:
"Observe, Enoch, these heavenly tablets,
and read what is written thereon,
and mark every individual fact!"
I Enoch 81: 1.

---

[1] See WIDENGREN, *Psalm 110*, and above, pp. 24 ff.
[2] See WIDENGREN, *HS* I 3, pp. 7—9.

Enoch then begins "to recount from the books" (Ch. 93: 1), as it is said, and professes his intention to declare the following to his sons:

> According to that which appeared to me in the heavenly vision,
> and which I have known through the word of the holy angels,
> and have learnt from the heavenly tablets.
>
> *I Enoch* 93: 2.

Beside the vision and the words of the angels, Enoch accordingly here mentions "the heavenly tablets" as a source of revelation. In this case, Enoch thus reads from the heavenly tablets; they are not given to him in the same way as they were handed over to Moses. The same type is found when the author himself speaks of the revelation communicated to him:

> I know a mystery,
> and have read the heavenly tablets,
> and have seen the holy books,
> and have found written therein and inscribed regarding them.
>
> *I Enoch* 103: 2 (cf. 106: 19).

The pattern of this proclamation we know very well from this investigation. And it is surely important to note that, among the Manichæans, Enoch belongs to the class of revelation-bringers styled "Apostle", *frēstag*.[1] This fact would seem to point to a Jewish-Gnostic speculation that counted Enoch as the "Apostle" who received the heavenly tablets. Descending in time, we may remind the reader of the name of Elxai. We do not possess much information as to the circumstances during which Elxai received his own book of revelation. But *that* he actually received this writing from the hand of an angel, is sufficiently clear.[2]

[1] See HENNING, *The Book of the Giants*, p. 151. The Manichæans speak of *βγγynpyk*, "God's book", *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1945, p. 151.

[2] The texts are: Hippol. IX 15; Epiph. XIX 4; XXX 17; LIII 1; Origen in Euseb., *Hist. eccles.* VI 58. These sources present contradicting relations. Hippolytus' statements may be understood as follows: "(Alcibiades) pretended that a righteous man Elchasai had received the same from the Seres of Parthia and gave it to one called Sobiae, as having been revealed by an angel"(transl. by LEGGE, *Philosophumena* II, p. 133). This notice in one detail must contain a misunderstanding for Sobiae, as BRANDT, *Elchasai*, p. 42, contends must be "the washed", i. e. a baptismal sect. I think Σοβιαι could be צוביא, *ṣōbī'aį*, with loss of the laryngal ʾ, perhaps then a South-Babylonian dialect. But it

On the whole, the heavenly tablets in the literature of early Judaism play a considerable rôle. It is interesting to note the different aspects of these writings. They are: (1) The Book of Life. (2) Books of remembrance of good and evil deeds. (3) The heavenly tablets in a proper sense are: a) records of laws, b) records of contemporary events, and c) predictions.[1] It is especially important to observe that on New Year's Day, according to Jewish ideas, the judgement is carried out when three kinds of tablets are presented, one for the righteous, one for sinners, and one for those occupying an intermediate position.[2] The connection between heavenly tablets, decision, and New Year's Day in itself is sufficient to show that the Mesopotamian pattern has been preserved. That the various aspects of these tablets in early Judaism can be explained only from the original conception of

---

must also be conceded that Greek transscriptions usually fail to render the laryngals, and for this reason no convincing argument can be drawn from the Greek transscription in this case. How the expression "from the Seres of Parthia" is to be interpreted is difficult to say, cf. BRANDT, *op. cit.*, p. 9. Anyhow, this expression must denote the local origin of the holy book; he had received it (παρειληφέναι) in that country (= ἀπό), and then handed it over to a baptismal sect, "the washed ones" (cf. BRANDT, *op. cit.*, p. 43). BRANDT, *op. cit.*, p. 59, thinks that the tradition of Elchasai having received his book from an angel is not correct, because Epiphanius does not mention it, and Origen (Euseb., *Hist. eccles.* VI 38) says that the book had fallen from heaven.

Now presumably exception can be taken to this argument on the ground that (1:o) Epiphanius has his defects in his statements, as is generally recognised; (2:o) the difference between receiving a book fallen from heaven and receiving it from the hands of an angel, descending from heaven, must not be overemphasized, the essential thing in both cases being the heavenly origin of the revealed book. We accordingly think it quite safe to conclude that Elchasai pretended to have accepted from heaven a holy book, handed over to him by the hands of an angel. This tradition could be simplified by stating that the book had come down to him from heaven. On the other hand a comparison with the Ḳur'anic ideas would seem to demonstrate that there has existed an independent type of the pattern according to which the Holy Book was sent down with an angel to the Apostle. Cf. the second part of these researches.

[1] See the survey in CHARLES, *The Book of Enoch*, p. 91 f., and STRACK-BILLERBECK, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament* II, pp. 169—176.

[2] See STRACK-BILLERBECK, *op. cit.*, II, p. 170, with reference to Rosh Hashshana I 57[a], 49 = SCHWAB, *Le Talmud de Jérusalem* VI, p. 64. Every country, too, is judged this day, ib., p. 63. People of an intermediate position are granted 10 days of repentance between New Year's Day and Yōm Kippurīm.

them as oracles of lots, is so obvious that no commentary is needed. Since everything to happen is decided by them, and then written upon them, we hereby gain all the meanings attached to them in Jewish writings. It is quite easy to trace all these notions back to Mesopotamian times.[1]

[1] See *ERE*, Vol. V, 793 a—794 a.

Chapter III

Samaritan, Jewish- and Samaritan-Gnostic, and Jewish Rabbinic Evidence

According to a Neo-Hebraic description of heaven, hell, and paradise, Moses once made an ascension to the highest heaven. We note first of all that Moses went up through the seven heavens, and in the seventh one he met God.[1] In this case we may quote from the translation of the text:

> God said to Moses:
> Moses, my servant! Thou camest up here and hast been worthy of the privilege of seeing all with thy power; and I have made thee ascend seven heavens, and have shown thee my treasures and I have given thee my law.
>
> Gaster, *JRAS* 1893, p. 550: 30.[2]

---

[1] For the conceptions of the seven heavens see Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, p. 500, n. 1, where literature is given, especially Meissner, *BuA* II, p. 108 ff. Bousset draws attention to the Ethiopic Book of Enoch 24: 1 ff. where Enoch sees seven mountains, in the midst of them the seventh resembling the seat of a throne, fragrant trees encircling the throne, among the trees a special tree, the tree of life, the fruit of which shall be given to the elect, and which shall be transplanted to the holy place, to the temple of the Lord. Everything in this description draws its material from ancient Mesopotamian mythology. In the Sumerian epic fragments of the Gilgamesh cycle there are expressly mentioned seven mountains, but puzzling enough, also the cedar mountain, see Kramer, *JAOS* 64/1944, p. 14. The tree of life, as planted in the holy place, near the temple basin, these two being the cultic equivalents of the mythic Tree of Life and the Water of Life, is mentioned sometimes in the Sumerian texts; see, for the time being, Widengren, *RoB* II/1943, p. 59 f., with references to *RISA*, p. 322: 12 ff., and p. 312: 1 ff. A very important text in this connection is *AnOr* 10, p. 214: 2—6, as compared with I Enoch 24: 3—4.

[2] The Hebrew text is not accessible to me. In view of the *mi'rāǧ*-descriptions in Islamic literature, I want to point out even here, the importance of the following passage from the visit paid by Moses to Paradise:

> Afterwards Moses looked and beheld a spring of living water welling forth from underneath the Tree of Life and dividing itself into four streams, and

There must in Jewish-Samaritan circles have existed a certain literature describing this ascent of his to heaven.[1] It is important to note that, in Samaritan texts, the ascension by Moses is related in mythical colours. In the commentary on the Pentateuch by Marqa we meet with several interesting traits.[2] Let us, however, first stress the general fact that, in Samaritan literature, Moses is elevated above the human sphere. He is pre-existent, as has been pointed out many times.[3]

He walked in the knowledge of Yahweh; from the day of the creation of Adam his spirituality was in this child, and his grandeur was in the world.

And he set him as a drop of light, from generation to generation to live in them,

and then he descended into Jochebed's womb, and was placed within her.[4]

An epithet of Moses is "the Star of Creation whom God created from the six days."[5] Moses is glorified in a stanza in the following words:

---

it comes from under the throne of glory, and they encompass the Paradise from one end to the other. And under each throne there flow four rivers, one of honey, the second of milk, the third of wine, and the fourth of purè balsam. These all pass beneath the feet of the just, who are seated upon the thrones.

GASTER, *JRAS* 1893, p. 587: 64.

In the passage on p. 597: 2 the rivers are said to be oil, balsam, wine, and honey. The same variation also meets in the *miʿrāǧ*-literature. For the notion of the thrones of the just, cf. below, p. 65, n. 3.

[1] For this literature, the *adscensio Mosis*, cf. Origenes, *De Principiis* III 2, 1 and BUTTENWIESER, *Neo-Hebraic Apocalyptic Literature*, pp. 19—22, discussing the text translated by GASTER from which we have just quoted some passages. It would seem that this *adscensio Mosis* is to be distinguished from the *assumptio Mosis* (ἀνάληψις Μωυσέως) describing his elevation *after* his death, not before.

[2] Marqa is most probably to be dated as belonging to the 4th century A. D., see MONTGOMERY, *The Samaritans*, p. 294; COWLEY, *The Samaritan Liturgy* II, p. XXI.

[3] See e. g. MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, p. 228 f.

[4] Text in HEIDENHEIM, *BS* II, p. 40, division ת, translated by MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, p. 228 (a slight change has been made in this translation). This description is of course strongly reminiscent of the "Light of Muḥammad" as observed by MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, p. 228. Cf., for the Islamic idea, ANDRÆ, *Die Person Muhammeds*, pp. 319 ff., and as a comparison add the Samaritan conception to the material adduced there.

[5] See MONTGOMERY, *op. cit.*, p. 228 f.

Prophecy was his,
a crown from the days of creation;
the prophethood of Moses,
which was worthy of him, clothed him.
Gesenius, *De Samaritanorum theologia*, p. 27.[1]

Now it is important to observe that this unique position held by Moses is attributed to him also in other writings inside Jewish religion. His pre-existence is thus obviously alluded to when it is said in *Assumptio Mosis* of the relation God—Moses:

Itaque excogitauit et inuenit me, qui ab initio orbis terrarum praeparatus sum, ut sim arbiter testamenti illius.
Assumptio Mosis I, 14.

In Samaritan hymns we meet with the conception that not only Moses but also the Book given to him is pre-existent. We will quote an explicit passage.

The handwriting of thy Glory
he received in greatness,
the great Book,
that exists from the days of creation.
Cowley, *The Samaritan Liturgy* I, p. 33: 7 = Szuster, *Marqa-hymnen*, p. 25: 11.[2]

Mose has "ascended", סלק, in order to receive the tablets of Law.

When the voice from heaven was heard to the prophet
and he ascended, received the Tablets,
Life being in them.
Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 53: 17 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 29: 4.[3]

We should compare this idea with the same one in Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 50: 10 ff. = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 28: 1, where it is said that God let himself down and sent down, אלא מכה ואחת, and

[1] Quoted in translation by Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 228.

[2] Text:
כיר אד יקירותך
קבל יתה ברבו
כתבה רבה
דמן יומי בריתה

[3] Text:
דקל מן שומיה אשמע לנביה
וסלק קבל לוחין
והויה לגבון

then the Prophet was elevated and ascended, ונביה ראם וסלק, when he received Life for all generations of eternity. This idea, that the Tablets contained Life, is constantly expressed.

The Tablets of covenant
thou hast handed over to the Son of thy house,
to make living from their Lord,
to all the living ones belongs Life.

Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 32: 8 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 23: 12.[1]

With the idea expressed in the last line we might perhaps compare the following passage where it is said that the Creator has ordered by means of Moses to whom he gave Life to Life.

Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 32: 14 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 23: 18.[2]

Is it not the opinion of the poet that Moses, who is himself living and Life, because of being pre-existent and emanating as Light from Light, is given Life in the outward form of the Tablets? This conception of Life being given to the world by means of the revelation of the divine Will is often met with. A typical passage runs as follows:

Thou hast revealed to the world
Life by means of Moses,
to his right hand thou hast handed over
Life from thy right hand.

Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 33: 8 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 25: 12.[3]

This notion is found also in non-Samaritan literature, and for this reason is conceivably older than the definite rupture between the Jews and the Samaritans.[4]

[1] Text:
לוהי בריתה
אושמת לבי ביתך
לחייה מן מרון
דכל חיין חיין

A slight modification in the transl. given by Szuster.

[2] Text:
צוה במשה יחב לה
חייה לחייה

[3] Text:
לעלמה גליך
חיין על אד משה
לימינה אושמת
מן ימינך חיין

[4] Szuster compares Midrash Tehillim, Chap. 119, where the teaching is called "Life", and further Prov. 3: 18, where Wisdom is said to be the Tree of Life.

The great Book, mentioned in the texts, is "Life from the Life of eternity", חיה דמן חיי עולם כתבה רבה (Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 50: 4 from below = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 29: 8). It is the "fountain of Life", מבועי דחיים (Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 50: 2 from below = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 29: 9), with which expression we should compare Prov. 3: 18 and such passages as Ps. 36: 10; Prov. 10: 11; 13: 14; 14: 27; 16: 22.

Now it is certainly interesting to note that these tablets of Life are *expressis verbis* identified with the five books of the Pentateuch.

The Mighty one to whom all belongs
spoke the word of Life.
As he is "He who stands" unto eternity,
so his writings are "standing" (to eternity).
Mighty is the Great Prophet,
who clad himself in the name of the Godhead,
and received the five books
and was he who stands between the two assemblies,
between "the standing ones" and the mortals.

Cowley, *op. cit.*, p. 54: 3 ff. from below = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 32: 16.[1]

Thus the Tora is actually the heavenly Book written by God Himself. God, "the Mighty and Terrible", has written the Great Book. That Book has been written with the finger of consuming fire" Cowley, *op. cit.* I, p. 49: 12 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 26: 2).

[1] Text:

חיולה דכלה דילה
מלל ממלל דחיים
היך דו קעים לעלם
כן כתביו קעימין
חויל חוא נביה רבה
דלבש שמ אלהותה
וקבל המשה ספרין
וקעים בין תרתין כנשאן
בין קעימין ובין מאתין

In the translation it is well nigh impossible to express the various shades of meaning of קעים, which means "standing", and hence also "eternal". The two assemblies are described in the following strophe. Here it is said of Moses that he is "the Elohim who is from mankind". Szuster has a good discussion on this point, *op. cit.*, p. 32, n. 212, referring also to Exod. 4: 16, where Moses is said to be "god" אלהים. For the expressions "He who stands", and the Great Prophet, see below, p. 48 f. The correct text in this passage has been reconstructed by Szuster.

This writing is the "Treasure of the words of blessing" (Cowley, *op. cit.*, I p. 49: 14 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 26: 4). The Holy Book is therefore "the Treasure" (Cowley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 49: 5 from below = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 27: 16). Here the term is not הוצר or אוצר, but סימתה.[1] We may also quote the following stanza:

The mouth of Life spoke
the Word of Life for the generations,
a word from the Treasure of Life.
Cowley, *op. cit.* I, p. 55: 1 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 32: 17.[2]

Life thus spoke the "Word of Life" from the "treasure of Life".

It is but natural that Moses, "the Great Prophet" (Cowley, *op. cit.* I, p. 49: 10, 16 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 26: 1, 6), should have his name mentioned together with that of God.

A shining Sun, that is not extinguished,
the name of God and the Prophet.
Cowley, *op. cit.* I, p. 50: 1 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, 50: 1.[3]

And the poet asks:

Where is a God like
the God of our fathers?
Where is a True Prophet
like the confident of God?
Cowley, *op. cit.* I, p. 32: 12 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 23: 16.[4]

---

[1] For the notion of "Treasure", se below, p. 53.

[2] Text:
פם דחיים מלל
ממלל חיים לדריה
ממלל מן כרר דחיים

Szuster translates "Der Mund des Lebendigen". I have preferred the translation given above because חיים properly denotes "life", a meaning that gives the effect aimed at by the poet, and also because, in the Samaritan writings, "life" has unquestionably become a term for God. For the idea of "Life", see below, p. 56 f.

[3] Text:
שמש מנור דלא טפי
שם אלה ונביא

[4] Text:
אחן אלה חך
אלהון דאבהתן
אחן נביא קשיט
כות מהימן אלה

Cf. Cowley, *op. cit.* I, p. 38 last line: "and there is not a True Prophet like Moses", ולא נביא קשיט כמשה.

With the expression "a True Prophet" we should compare a passage where it is said that Moses "received a Book of Truth, without deficiency" (Cowley, *op. cit.* II, p. 745: 19), וקבל כתב קשט לא אליל. It is possible that the Hebrew equivalent of נביא קשיט is הנבי הנאמן (found in Gesenius, *Carmina Samaritana*, p. 38, VII 3). We shall revert to these expressions.[1]

Against this background the description of how Moses received The Heavenly Book during his ascension to God can claim our increased interest and attention. It is said in the commentary by Marqa that Moses dwelt in the tent of the angels and bathed in their bath. He was given bread by the angels, eating at their table.[2] When writing down the holy books he was sitting on a great throne.[3] Accordingly, at his ascension, Moses is given the food of the angels and their purification. He is enthroned and receives from God Himself the heavenly wisdom which, in this case, he is said to have written down, being instructed by his Lord.[4] We note that, in this relation, Moses is called the "Great Prophet". In another passage it is said that the Law was placed in his hands at his ascension to heaven.

> And he ascended to heaven,
> and the Torah was put on his hand,

Gesenius, *Carmina Samaritana*, p. 40 (text) XII, 30, p. 104 (transl.).

Thus we may sum up the result of our short survey. In Samaritan and Neo-Hebraic literature, but especially in the former, Moses, who is elevated above the human sphere, and in Samaritan literature thought to be pre-existent and divine, ascends to heaven. There, according to the Marqa-commentary, he is enthroned, is purified in the bath of the angels, and given their food to eat. He writes down the Heavenly Book that is dictated to him by

---

[1] See below, p. 55 f.

[2] For the notion of the heavenly food as given to the ascending visionary, or prophet, or king, or baptizand, cf. Widengren, *HS* I 3, p. 5 f., and *RoB* V/1946, p. 33 f., 45, 49 f., 53, 56.

[3] Text in Heidenheim *BS* III, p. 72: 6—9. It is interesting to note, in view of p. 29 above, n. 4, that it is said: ובכיורן צבע, "and he bathed in their *kiyor*." There accordingly exists a *kiyor* in the heavenly temple as well as in the earthly. Cf. above, p. 40, n. 1. For צבע cf. Σοβιαι above, p. 37, n. 2.

[4] Text: כתב מה אלפה מרה בהספר, "he wrote what his Lord taught him in the Book."

God. In the hymns, however, the general notion is that God himself had written the holy Tablets, identified with the five books of the Pentateuch, and handed them over to Moses.[1] This book is called the Great Book, it is the fountain of Life, it is Life from the Life of eternity. For this reason it is spoken of as the Treasure of Life, as well as the Word of Life and the Book of Truth. The holy, heavenly tablets contain Life and Truth, a common Jewish, not only Samaritan idea.[2] Hence Moses who received them is extolled in every possible manner. He is the Great Prophet, the True Prophet, or even called a "god". He is the real mediator between heaven and earth. His name is mentioned together with God's own name.

Moses is, however, not the only bringer of divine revelation. This is clear from the following passage:

"Sent Ones" from thy mercy
to the bases among our elders
send thou to our salvation
and to the destroyers of our haters.
COWLEY, *op. cit.* I, p. 31: 17 = SZUSTER, *op. cit.*, 22: 21.[3]

In this place we meet with the well-known term, the Sent One, שׁלוחא. Such "apostles" are sent for the salvation of the believers and for the destruction of their enemies. It is important to note that, even in the O. T., Moses is looked upon as an Apostle, a Sent One.[4] The Jewish tradition expressly gives him the term שלוח.[5] The royal traits in the traditional picture of Moses have very often been emphasized.[6]

From these passages in Samaritan writings, chiefly the liturgies, we may pass to a brief examination of some religious charismatic

[1] The Rabbinic doctrine is that God has given the Tora in a written form, see e. g. WEBER, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 101 f.

[2] For Rabbinic ideas in the same direction, see WEBER, *op. cit.*, p. 20 f.

[3] Text:
שלחין מן רחמיך
לאיקרי סחבינן
שלח לפרקנן
ולאבדני סנינן

[4] For the implication of Exod. 3: 13; 4: 28, see WIDENGREN, *RoB* II/1943, p. 71. Cf. above, p. 31.

[5] See *Theol. Wb. z. NT* I, 419, 5 ff. with references. It is important to note that Metatron, too, is *šālīaḥ*, WEBER, *op. cit.*, p. 179.

[6] See e. g. PEDERSEN, *Israel* III—IV, p. 662 f., and above, p. 28 f.

leaders, proceding from Samaritan circles, but developing their preaching into a clearly Gnostic direction, viz. Dositheos, Simon, and Menander. Simon, as is well known, from the outset belonged to the 30 disciples of Dositheos, whom he however surpassed in magical capacity, according to tradition, and for this reason replaced as a leader.[1]

Now the Samaritan background of Simon ought to be accentuated in quite another way than has seemingly been the case. And especially the comparison between the doctrines of Simon and those of the Samaritan liturgies — preferably the hymns composed by Marqa — that invites itself, has been altogether neglected.[2] Such a comparison would in itself be a special task, and cannot be undertaken within the rather narrow framework of this investigation. So we have to content ourselves with a few indications.

We may start with the idea that has perhaps above all made Simon known to us, viz. his claim of being *the Great Power*. A great many instances could be quoted in support of the contention that the idea of the Great Power as being incarnated in Simon is the central notion in his preaching. This Great Power, ἡ μεγάλη δύναμις, is at the same time the Standing One, ὁ ἑστώς.[3]

[1] A comprehensive account of sources and problems is given by Cerfaux, *La gnose Simonienne* in *RSR*, 15—16/1925—26. See also Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 163—186; Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, pp. 60—110; De Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*, pp. 216—226, 430—432.

[2] Montgomery, *op. cit.*, p. 268, goes so far as to give the following statement: "So far as we have been able to sound the obscure ages of Samaritan religion, even according to the hostile Jewish evidence, we can find no syncretistic features therein, no native tendency to Gnosticism. Simon Magus appears not as a type of Samaritanism, but only as an incident, doubtless there is exaggeration concerning the universality of his influence upon the Samaritans, as recorded in *Acts* and by Justin. From what we learn of his doctrine in these two sources he probably found his following rather amongst the Hellenistic population of Samaria, than in the Samaritan sect. His claim to be the Great Power of God represents nothing we find in Samaritan doctrine, whose Messianism was of a very primitive type". Contrast this dictum with our summary of different points of contact between Samaritan religion and Gnosticism. Even Heidenheim, *BS* II, pp. XXXV—XL, has demonstrated his sensibility to the "gnosticisms" in Samaritan literature. One point of agreement between Simon and Samaritan writings has further been alluded to by Cerfaux, see below, p. 49, n.

[3] Some passages: Hippol. VI 13: ἡ μεγάλη δύναμις ἡ ἀπέραντος, ὁ ἑστώς;

The terms of the Great Power used in the Syriac translation of the Ps. Clem. literature are both *ḥaiḻā ḳaḏmāiḻā* (*Rec.* III 47, 1), *ḥaiḻā ʿellāiḻā* (*Rec.* I 72, 3), and *ḥaiḻā kasiḻā* (some passages in the sequel). The Greek term ὁ ἑστώς is rendered *ḳā'em* everywhere. There is no Syriac translation of the Greek passages where the actual term ἡ μεγάλη δύναμις is found, but we may safely assume that the Syriac equivalent must have been *ḥaiḻā rabbā*.[1]

In the movement founded by Dositheos and carried on by Simon and his disciple Menander these conceptions have obviously played a great rôle. Dositheos at first claimed to be ὁ ἑστώς (*Ps. Clem. Rec.* II 8 f., 11)[2], and this title was accordingly inherited from him by Simon.

Approximately the same claims were upheld by Menander. Irenaeus gives the following statement about him:

> qui primam quidem virtutem incognitam ait hominibus, se autem eum esse,
> qui missus sit ab invisibilibus, salvatorem pro salute hominum.
>
> Iren., *adv. haer.*, I, 23, 5.[3]

The *prima virtus* must obviously be another designation of the Great Power, because First Power and Great Power are alternative terms. In the Ps. Clem. literature we have just met with the First Power, *ḥaiḻā ḳaḏmāiḻā*. Menander claims to be the

---

VI 17, 1—2; Ps. Clem. II 7, 1 (cf. I 72: 3; III 46: 6—47: 1); Homil. II 22: 24; XVIII 12; 14. This Power is obviously aimed at in the statement: "There is ... that blessed and incorruptible thing *hidden* in everything, in power (potentially) not in energy (actively), which is He who Stands, Stood, and will Stand, Hippol. VI 17, 1. Some literature: Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, pp. 92 ff., 98, 101; Waitz, *Die Pseudo-Klementinen*, p. 172; Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 163 ff., 453 ff. Cerfaux, *RSR* 16/1926 pp. 489—494. He has rightly pointed out, p. 493, n. 2, that the Samaritan liturgy knows the term "Standing", קעים. As we have ample opportunity to see in this chapter, this is not an isolated fact in the lines of connection between Samaritan liturgies and Gnosis.

[1] See below, p. 52, n. 1.

[2] Text: homines qui eum putabant ipsum esse "Stantem," *Recogn.* II, 11.

[3] ἑαυτὸν μὲν ὡς ἄρα εἴη, λέγων, ὁ σωτὴρ ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἄνωθέν ποθεν ἐξ ἀοράτων ἀιώνων ἀπεσταλμένος σωτηρίᾳ. For the equation ἀπεσταλμένος = ܫܠܝܚܐ cf. John 13: 16; a sent one, ܫܠܝܚܐ, is not greater than he who sends him: The Greek text uses here ἀπόστολος.

missus of this First Power. The parallel passage in Eusebius', *H. E.*, III 26, 1, as the Greek equivalent, uses ἀπεσταλμένος, which obviously corresponds to an Aramaic *šᵉlīḥā*.[1] Menander thus held that he was the Sent One of the First Power (= the Hidden Power). Tertullian is accordingly quite right when he says: *in hoc scilicet se a superna et arcana potestate legatum* (*De anima* 50). In this *superna et arcana potestas* we recognize, without any difficulty, the terms *ḥaiḷā ʿellāiā* and *ḥaiḷā kasiā* of the Ps. Clem. literature.

Other Jewish-Samaritan prophets have claimed to know who the Great Power was. In this connection we should mention the sect of the Melchisedekians. They originated from a certain money changer Theodotus, who said "that a certain Melchisedek was the Greatest Power, and that he was greater than Christ" (Hippol. VII 36). In agreement with this notice is both Philaster 52, who speaks of certain heretics who *addunt etiam Melchisedek sacerdotum virtutem dei magnam esse*, and Theodor bar Konay, who says of this movement that "they hold that Melchizedek was the Great Power and not a simple man" (Pognon, *Inscriptions mandaïtes*, p. 122: 9 text, p. 177 transl.). The Syriac term used here is of course *ḥaiḷā rabbā*.[2]

To return to Dositheos, who apparently inaugurated this movement, we know that his disciples possessed holy Scriptures, written by their master (φέροντες καὶ βίβλους τοῦ Δοσιθέου, Origen,

[1] When Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*, p. 105, says: "Ebenso ist eine Annäherung an die Gedankenwelt des hellenistischen Christentums darin zu spüren, dass Menandros nicht mehr als Verkörperung der grossen Kraft, sondern nur als Gesandter der Unsichtbaren auftritt, so wie sich auch Jesus im Johannesevangelium so oft als den bezeichnet, der von Gott in die Welt 'gesandt' ist," this statement unfortunately misses the point. As we have tried to demonstrate not only in this investigation but also in other works (see *The Great Vohu Manah*, Index, s. v. Apostle, *fraēšta*, Messenger and *Mesopotamian Elements*, Index, s. v. Apostle, *ašgandā*, Messenger, and especially p. 173 f.), the term "The Sent One" (or the Apostle-Messenger) is the technical term for the Saviour as being "sent" from the High God in order to bring revelation to the world and save it from the evil powers. The Sent One is usually the earthly representative and incarnation of God, his Son.

[2] Text: ولاحتنع وإسلاموب صلاحسروه سدلا ذحا ولا حتنعا وحه عسعدا

Not understood as to its technical meaning by Pognon, who translates "une grande force". Cf. our reconstruction of the Syriac equivalent of the μεγάλη δύναμις in the Ps. Clement. literature. Cf. further below, p. 52, n. 1.

In Ioann. XIII, 27). Origen says that Dositheos claimed to be the Messiah, prophesied by Moses, Deut. 18: 15, 18 (*Contra Cels.* I, 57). By this claim he had tried to convince his Samaritan compatriots of his position as Son of God (*Contra Cels.* VI, 11).

Simon, again, who also like Dositheos pretended to be both ὁ ἑστώς and the Great Power, just as his deposed master, had his own presumably holy scriptures. This conclusion must be drawn from the following passage in the Ps. Clem. literature, where Peter says to Simon:

> Hunc quem dicis esse incomprehensibilem et incognitum omnibus deum, ex scripturis Iudaeorum, quae in auctoritate habentur, probare potes, an ex aliis aliquibus, quas omnes ignoramus, an ex graecis auctoribus, *an ex tuis scripturis propriis*? certo ex quibuscunque vis dicito, ita tamen, ut ostendas eas prius esse propheticas.
>
> Recogn. II, 38.

We cannot, however, be positive about the identity of these scriptures with the "Great Exposition", although this book was put in circulation under the protection of the name of Simon.[1]

The term the Hidden Power is met with in contexts showing that it must approximately be identical with the Great Power. In Ps. Clem. literature Rec. II 50, 21; 51, 6 (ed. Frankenberg, p. 132: 6 and 6 from below) the Syriac expression is *ḥaʾilā kasiā* and is obviously the same as the Great Power, for this term here designates the highest and unknown God.[2] In *Testamentum Adami* (*JA* Sér. V: 2 [1853], p. 439 text, and p. 452, transl.) we find the same Syriac expression.

The appellation of Elksai, according to the most probable explanation given by Epiphanius I 1, 2, is to be understood as the Hidden Power, and thus reveals his claims to be of the same nature as those of the Samaritan prophets.[3]

[1] For the whole question, see Cerfaux, *RSR* 16/1926, pp. 18 ff. (perhaps a little too sceptical, for we know too little of Simon to be able to say: "Ni la plume de Simon, ni la doctrine de sa secte ne sont dignes d'un morceau d'allure si distinguée", *ib.* p. 20). Cf. already Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, p. 453 f.

[2] See *Homil.* XVIII 12. For the term "the Great Power", cf. also Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, p. 316, n. 1.

[3] The text has: καλεῖν τοῦτον Δύναμιν κεκαλυμμένην, διὰ τὸ Ἰηλ καλεῖσθαι δύναμιν, Ξαὶ δὲ κεκαλυμμένον.

In the baptism used in the Jewish-Christian sect behind the Ps. Clem. literature we find the notion that a certain mysterious Power comes down upon the water in baptism: *est enim in aquis istis misericordiae vis quaedam, quae ex initio ferebatur super eas* (*Recogn.* VI, 9).[1]

In view of the connections that in this chapter we are trying to establish between Jewish and Samaritan-Gnostic conceptions and Mandaean religion, it is certainly interesting to note the following passage from *Drāšē ḏmalkē*.

When they pronounce my name over the Jordan,
my Power lodges over it,
and through me the Jordan ascends
and there is firmness for the Uthras.
It gives them speech and hearing
and makes them conquer the perishable.
It gives them a shining shape,
and my Power and my championships are lodging on the Jordan.

Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch*, p. 217: 11—15 (text), p. 206: 28—207: 6 (transl.).[2]

The original form would thus be חדיל כסי, see also Brandt, *Elchasai*, p. 7 f. This form of the participle is interesting because one would expect -ē or ī; cf. Dalman, *Grammatik des judisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*, p. 340, 8. In the derived forms we find the ending *-ai*, and *k^{e}saį* thus reflects the older stage.

[1] The parallel passage in *Homil.* XI 26 has only: ἔστιν γάρ τι ἐκεῖ ἀπαρχῆς ἐλεῆμον, ἐπιφερόμενον τῷ ὕδατι.

That the term "the Great Power" was used in Jewish-Christian circles as the designation of God seems to be apparent from Eusebius, *H. E.* II 23, 13, where Jacob says that Jesus (here called Son of Man) is sitting to the right side of the Great Power. The Syriac transl. ed. Wright & Mc Lean, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius*, p. 103: 6 f., has of course *ḥaįlā rabbā*. Cf. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, p. 164, where he refers to Eusebius but seems not to understand that *ḥaįlā rabbā* is a technical term (not only "Power" = δύναμις = *ḥaįlā*).

[2] The Text:

כה שומאי על יארדנא תאדכירלה
האילאי עלה שאריא
ובגאבאי סאליק יארדנא
והאוילון שראר לעותריא
ואחריבלון עמרא ושומא
ומזאכילון מן אידרא
ואחריבלון דמותא נאחירתא
והאילאי וגאבארואתאי
על יארדנא שריא

The speaker is the "Treasure of Life", the designation of the sum of the souls, the collective Soul, acting as saviour.[1] We should observe that the name of the Saviour is pronounced over the Jordan, the term for baptismal water among the Mandaeans. Then the Power of the Saviour descends on the baptismal water which is ascending, the heavenly beings, the Uthras, being provided with *šrārā* — a complex notion, denoting what is firm, lasting, and hence true. This term acccordingly signifies both firmness and truth. The Uthras are given by means of the Jordan, the baptismal water, both speech and hearing, an ancient Mesopotamian formula.[2] The water of Jordan makes them triumph over their perishable existence and gives them a shining shape, i. e. they are changed from perishable to imperishable beings, given a divine position, while the Saviour's Power and his heroic deeds are resting on the Jordan. The expression "heroic deeds", "championships", *gabbarwātā* causes some difficulty. What are the heroic deeds of the Saviour in this case? Has a fight preceded his descent to the Jordan? This question must for the present be left open.[3]

This conception of the Divine Power descending on the baptismal water corresponds to the much later idea in the Syrian church, which is of the same kind. In the liturgical homilies of Narsai we very often meet with this notion of the Hidden Power coming down upon the baptismal water.[4] Against this background it is very easy to understand a passage in the letters of the so-called "John of Lykopolis". Here the author, when speaking of baptism, says: "But it is not the nature of the water that renews us, but the descent of the Hidden Power."[5]

[1] For the notion of the "Treasure", see, for the time being, WIDENGREN, *The Great Vohu Manah*, Additional Note, No. 1.

[2] The expression in the Accadian psalms is *ḳabū šemū*, "speech and hearing"; see WEIR, *Lexicon of Accadian Prayers*, s. v.

[3] We think of course of the victory of the Saviour over the chaos-power, the Dragon; cf. above the victory over Zū; see further WIDENGREN, *Mesopotamian Elements*, pp. 41 ff.

[4] Cf. such passages as CONNOLLY, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, pp. 47, 50, 56, 60.

[5] This passage has not been understood by the editor and translator, who speaks of "das Innewohnen einer geheimen Kraft", see RIGNELL, *Briefe von Johannes dem Einsiedler*, p. 54; text p. 35*: ܐܠܐ ܠܐ ܗܕܐ ܡܝܐ ܕܥܒܕ ܐܢܫܐ ܐܠܐ ܢܚܬܬ ܪܘܚܐ ܟܡܝܪܐ ܕܟܡ. On *ruḥāfā*, the "descent" of the Holy

To this complex probably also belongs chapter 27 of the Acts of Thomas, where the epiclesis mentions the Holy Spirit that is called "thou Power of the Most High".[1] The epiclesis is recited by the Apostle when baptizing king Gundofarr and his brother. It is thus the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the baptismal water that is asked for by Thomas. And in another baptismal scene the Apostle says:

> Glory to thee, Hidden Power, that art communicated in baptism!
> Glory to thee, the Unseen Power, that art visible in baptism!
> Glory to thee, Renewal, whereby are renewed they that are baptized ...
> Glory to thee, Hidden Power, that dwellest in the Messiah!
> *Acts of Thomas*, ch. 132.[2]

This invocation of the Hidden Power has quite naturally found its way also into the Nestorian baptismal liturgy, where it is said that Satan, the lord of the world, is conquered by means of it.[3]

It may not be out of place to quote a Samaritan passage where the situation is quite different, but where the idea of the

---

Spirit upon the baptismal waters, see HAUSHERR, *Jean le Solitaire*, p. 101 n. Of course, it is not any anonymous power, but even God's own Power, in the Syrian church identified with the Holy Spirit. We note that HAUSHERR, *OCP* XIV/1948, p. 13 f., also translates "l'incubation d'une force secrète."

[1] Text and discussion in WIDENGREN, *Mesopotamian Elements*, p. 168 f., with reference also to BORNKAMM, *Mythos und Legende*, pp. 89 ff.

[2] Text in BEDJAN, *AMS* 3, p. 139, and WRIGHT, *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles* I, p. هلا, II, p. 267 XI. Cf. also the following epiclesis: Thou art the Great Power and the Wisdom and the Gnosis and the Will and the Rest of thy Father. WRIGHT *op. cit.* I, p. محلى, II, p. 154; BEDJAN, *op. cit.*, p. 11. There are some interesting differences in the texts of BEDJAN and WRIGHT. I have followed BEDJAN whose text in this case is considerably more original. Several other references could be given.

The translation given in the text above is based upon the Syriac text with some attention attached to the Greek version which in two cases has presumably retained the original wording. Thus we should obviously read:

لحي معجسا سلا 〈حصا〉 ؟حصحصه؟ا محسا

and: لحي معجسا سبلا؟ 〈؟حه〉 محتبلح الحي 〈؟حصبح〉

[3] DIETTRICH, *Die nestorianische Taufliturgie*, p. 18.

descending of this mysterious Power is found. God's own descent to Sinai is said to be that of the "Great Power".

And the Great Power was shaken
and its Glory descended in the midst.
Cowley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 54: 1 = Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 30: 8.[1]

The additional data from Syrian literature have not been void of relevance to our proper theme, because they have shown that, with the Hidden Power, the Holy Spirit is to be understood. When in Samaritan and Jewish-Christian writings we meet with the same expression, it would seem but natural to assume the same terminology. If this be so, it would easily explain the thought that the Prophet (or as we may say: the Apostle, in the most technical sense of the word) is the Great Power (the Hidden Power), for the theological speculation behind this claim is that he is the incarnate Spirit of God. We are thus confronted with a well-known mythologoumenon of the Ancient Near East that will occupy us in the sequel of these researches.

In the Samaritan liturgies we have also found the title of "the true Prophet". It has not been observed, as far as we have been able to control literature, that this title is another connecting link with the Samaritan-Jewish Gnosis, because we meet with this very expression in the Ps. Clem. writings.[2] It is interesting to note that in the Syriac translation this term is *nabḥā dašrārā*[3], but in the Samaritan liturgies the term is נביא קשיט. There is, however, a constant change between שראר and כושטא, e. g. in Mandaean literature, and for this reason it is impossible to make out if the original Aramaic term in the circle behind the Ps. Clem. writings was נביא דקושטא or נביא דשראר.[4] The possibility exists, in fact, that it was actually neither expression,

[1] Text:
חזדוע חילה רבה
ונהת לגו כבידה

Szuster gives a somewhat different translation.

[2] See e. g. the survey given by Cerfaux in *RSR* 18/1928, pp. 143 ff.

[3] E. g. *Recogn.* I, 34, 4: نحل معمل. One alternative term is "the Good Prophet", نحل لحل, *Rec.* I, 40, 1.

[4] For this change cf. *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 165, XCIX: מאמלא דשראר — מאלאלא כשיטא. This passage is instructive also from the point of demonstration of the same shift שראר — קשיט as in the two designations of the Prophet given above in the text. This change is found e. g. in *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 214: 8.

but the same as the Samaritan one, viz. נביא קשיט. Anyhow the probability would seem to be with the stem קשט, for we remember that the baptismal formula of the Marcosians, for instance, invoked קושטא[1], and that קושטא plays a rôle in the Syriac translation of the Johannine prologue with its Aramaic background.[2] That the notion of "Truth", Kušṭā, is one of the most important ideas in Mandaean religion, is well known, but a designation "the True Prophet" seems to be lacking in the writings hitherto published. On the whole, "Prophet" is not the general term for the Saviour who brings Revelation, but "Apostle" or "Messenger", as we shall see in the sequel.[3] And there are indeed passages speaking of "the True Apostles", or "the Apostles of Kušṭā". The term in this case is שליחיא דכושטא (Petermann, *R. G.*, p. 63: 11). Especially interesting is the following passage where a slightly different term is found:

I am the Apostle of Light
whom the Great One hath sent into this world.
The True Apostle I am
with whom there is no lie;
The True One, with whom there is no lie,
there is not with him deficiency or fault.

Petermann, *R. Ginzā*, p. 64: 20—22 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 58: 17—22.[4]

The Samaritan and Ps. Clementine "True Prophet" thus have their Mandaean counterpart in the "True Apostle", *šlīhā kušṭānā*.[5]

Other points of contact deserve mentioning. Besides such general equivalents as the notions of "Life" and "Truth" and

[1] See Iren. 21, 3, and cf. Gressmann in *ZNW* 16/1915, pp. 191 ff.: ῥουαδὰ κουστὰ = רוחה דקושטא. Cf. also Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch*, p. XVIII.

[2] Ev. Ioann. 1: 14, cf. Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 50. In the *wording* "grace and truth" one would be tempted to see (with Zahn) an allusion to Exod. 34: 6.

[3] See below, p. 59.

[4] The text:

שליחא אנא דנהורא
דרבא שדראן להאזין אלמא
שליחא אנא כושטאנא
דכאדבא ליתבה
כושטאנא דליתבה כאדבא
יליית בנאיה האסיר ובציר

[5] It is important to notice the different terms for "truth" and "true".

the speculation around them, we want to point out two special expressions which have been quoted above from the Samaritan liturgies, viz. the Word of Life, and the Treasure of Life. We should thus compare the Samaritan expression ממלל חיים with the Mandaean מאלאלא דהייא (Petermann, *R. Ginzā*, p. 292: 8), or מינילת חייא (מינילתא דהייא), or even פוגדאמא דהייא (*Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 35: 6).[1] And furthermore the Samaritan expression "Treasure of Life", כרי חיים[2], corresponds to Mandaean סימתא דהייא, or סימאת חייא, or אוצארהאר, or אוצאר חייא (*Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 43: 9), or גינזאיהון דהייא (*Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 102: 9), is גינזא דהייא *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 251: 5).[3] The alternative expressions probably correspond to various layers of tradition. Besides we have to reckon with the natural love in Mandaean literature for synonymous expressions. This different manner of expressing the same idea in the Mandaic language shows that the slightly different Samaritan terms are to be understood as perfectly equivalent synonyms. It is obviously the *idea* of a Treasure of Life that is important, not the changing expressions, which only claim our interest in so far as they can be taken as indications of various layers and geographical-cultural influences.

It must be a task for future research to supplement the investigations along these lines and to try to establish the extent of the connection between that part of Samaritan literature that belongs to the oldest stratification (as was the case with the Marqa-hymns adduced here), Samaritan-Jewish Gnosicism, and Mandaean religion. The framework into which the relevant facts had to be presented here, as was already remarked, of necessity

---

[1] Thus, we also possess an Iranian loanword in Mandaean, *pugdāmā* < *paδgām*, a Parthian form (= Armenian *patgam*, Horn, *Grundriss d. neupers. Etymologie*, No. 348; Hübschmann, *Armenische Grammatik*, p. 222) as contrasted with the Persian form *paigām*, see Tedesco, *MO* XV/1921, p. 195, 7. We note that another Mandaic term for "word" is מאמלא, see above, p. 55, n. 4.

[2] We also find אוצר שומיה, see Szuster, *op. cit.*, p. 10, n. 31, where he points out an addition in the London MS to the hymn, Cowley, *op. cit.*, I, p. 12—14.

[3] As to this survey, cf. Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch*, p. 201 f., where we lack the expressions having *ginzā*. Lidzbarski, *ib.*, has further compared the corresponding Syriac terms ܢܨܘ ܢܬܐ and ܡܫܡܫܐ ܢܬܐ. Add to his references that Christ is called ܡܫܡܫܐ ܢܬܐ in Lamy, *Ephraem ... Hymni et Sermones* IV col. 533: 10.

exercised a restricting influence as to the material that could be included, and we are afraid that we have perhaps actually transgressed the proper bounds of our main theme.[1]

To sum up the results of this chapter: the Samaritan liturgies have shown us the existence of a remarkable speculation around the Heavenly Book and its acceptance by the Great Prophet (True Prophet), Moses. We have also found indications that this Prophet was looked upon as the Sent One, being in the proper sense of the word a pre-existent being. But, moreover, we gained a series of technical expressions: the Standing One, the True Prophet, the Treasure of Life, Word of Life, Life etc. that partly alluded to a connection between Samaritan and Jewish-Gnostic, indeed even Mandaean circles. These lines of direction will be followed in the next chapter, where we will try to investigate the Mandaean notions of the Apostle and his ascent to heaven.

[1] Interesting points of contact could be established, as to baptismal rites, between the Mandaeans and Western (Jewish-Syrian) Gnosticism. Some hints have been given in a previous investigation in *RoB* V/1946. It is my intention to return to this question, and especially to emphasize the connecting link provided by the circles described in *De Rebaptismate* with their *baptisma decurtatum et mutilatum*. The whole question of the Western origin of the Mandaeans as connected with their own designation of themselves entered upon a new phase since the term *nāṣorāyē* appeared in the inscription of Kartēr, the leading *magupat* of the time of Šāhpuhr. I. Here the נצראי are mentioned along with the Christians, כרסתידאן, and accordingly cannot be identified with them. We shall revert to this problem. A curious detail quite *à part* may not be out of place here. Even GESENIUS, *Carmina* Samaritana, p. 70, n. 12, has rightly pointed out that the use of עותרן in the Samaritan songs excellently illustrates the Mandaean term עותרא, which NÖLDEKE too, in his *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 104, § 91, interpreted as meaning nothing but "richness". Cf the *Odes of Solomon* XLI 8; pointed out by REITZENSTEIN, Das iranische. Erlösungsmysterium p. 91 n. 5, where he says: "Der mandäische Wortgebrauch geht weiter, aber er gibt hierfür die Erklärung und empfängt vielleicht, wie mir Prof. Lidzbarski bestätigt, auch seinerseits von hier Licht." It would seem then that LIDZBARSKI was inclined to change the opinion expressed in his *Uthra und Malakha* p. 2 f. (*Orientalische Studien* THEODOR NÖLDEKE . . . *gewidmet* p. 538 f.).

Chapter IV

Mandaean Literature

In Mandaean literature we meet with the scene of investiture in heaven, when the highgod, "the Father of the Uthras", summons before him the young god and conveys to him a commission to be carried out. In this case it is Bhaq-Zīwā who wants a world to be created, and for that purpose sends Ptāhil down to non-existence.[1]

He summoned Ptāhil-Uthra,
  caressed him and kissed him like magnates.
He put names on him,
  which are hidden and preserved on their place.[2]
He called him "Gabriel, the Apostle",
  summoned him, gave him a command and said to him:

[1] For the name of Ptāhil, see the discussion by Lidzbarski, *Das Johannesbuch*, p. XXVII f., and cf. *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. XXI f. As Lidzbarski in the last-mentioned work, p. XXII, n. 1, says: "פתא האי enthält vielleicht eine Entlehnung aus dem Kanaanäischen und bedeutet 'Lebensporte'", he seems to have abandoned his earlier opinion that פתא in Mandaean could not mean "gate". But if Ptā-Hai can mean "Gate of Life", it is impossible to understand why Ptāhil should not be "Gate of God". The difficulty that "god" is usually written עיל, is not impossible to overcome, for Hibil is surely modelled after other compounds with *-ēl*, as is previously recognized, and is nevertheless spelt הביל. Then there remains the spelling with ה in Ptāh. This trait could be explained by assuming an older stage where this *h* is the attenuation of an original *ḥ*, perhaps the indication of a loan-word.

[2] The notion of the hidden names is met with, e. g., among the Marcosians, Irenaeus I 21, 3: τὸ ὄνομα τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον. Cf. the hidden name as mentioned in the *Ethiopic Book of Enoch*, ch. 69: 14, where we read: "This (angel) requested Michael to show him the hidden name, that he might enunciate it in the oath, so that those might quake before that name and oath that revealed all that was in secret to the children of men." For the same conception in Rabbinic sources see Kaplan, *The hidden Name*, *JSOR* XIII/1929. We trace in these Gnostic and Rabbinic texts the origin of the Islamic idea of the hidden name of Allāh, his greatest name. Metatron is called with names of honour by God, and given seventy names, III Hebrew Book of Enoch XLVIII (C) 8—9. For the hidden name cf. also Connolly *op. cit.* p. 40.

"Arise, go away and descend
down to the room where there are no Skinas and no worlds!
Create and bring forth to thee a world
like the sons of peace that thou hast seen!"

Right Ginzā, ed. Petermann, p. 93: 19—23 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 98: 7—18.[1]

In this passage we note the summoning of the Apostle, his calling by names by the highgod, his receiving of his commission and his being sent into the world of non-existence. We remember these ritual moments: the interview between God and the Apostle, his receiving names of honour and his being sent out. In ancient Mesopotamian mythology this sending out was connected with the battle against the dragon *Labbu*.[2] Now we ought to keep in mind that this fight precedes the creation of a cosmos, being in itself a victory over the powers of chaos. Thus we think it quite possible, in this case, to establish a connecting link between the Mesopotamian pattern and the Mandaean cosmological conception.

It is interesting to note that the sending out of a creator-god is related in Pseudo-Clementine literature, Homil. XVIII 12. From the Great Power two angels are sent out, one in order to create the world, the other in order to be its law-giver.[3] This is important on account of the relation that we are trying to establish between the Jewish-Samaritan Gnostic baptismal movements and certain layers in Mandaean literature. For we should note that

[1] Text:

קרא לפתאחיל עותרא
האננה ונישקה כד רורביא
אסימלה שימהאתא
דכסעיא ומיאטריא* באתראין
אסימלה גאברעיל שליחא
וקרא ופאקדה ואמארלה
קום אסגיא חות
לחית דוכתא דליבא שביואתא וליבא אלמיא
קריא ושאריא אלמא לנאפשאך
אבואת בניא שלאמא דהויח

[2] See above, p. 18.

[3] The text Homil. XVIII 12 runs: ἐκ τῆς μεγάλης δυνάμεως, ἔτι τε καὶ τῆς κυρίας λεγομένης, ... δύο ἀπεστάλθαι ἀγγέλους, τὸν μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ κτίσαι κόσμον, τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ θέσθαι τὸν νόμον. For the notion of the Power as a female potency, cf. the *Acts of Thomas*, ch. 27, quoted above, p. 54.

it has been rightly observed that Gabriel, the Apostle, belongs even to that layer of tradition that reveals its Jewish origin.[1]

In Ginzā there is a cosmological passage describing how, at the first "calling" (בקריתא)[2], Yāwar-Zīwā glorified his father, Life, in a little hymn. Then the text continues:

> When Life, his father, heard these words from Yāwar-Zīwā, they were so agreeable to him that he put his right hand upon him, placed a crown of victories[3] on his head, instructed him from his (own) knowledge, and called him "Our Garment" and "Our Word". And he was called "the Word of Life".

PETERMANN, *R. Ginzā*, p. 292: 5—8 = LIDZBARSKI, *Ginzā*, p. 289: 8—11.[4]

This scene describes a kind of adoption and enthronement. The Highest God puts his right hand upon his Son, crowns him, imparts his own knowledge to him, and gives him two names, expressing the close connection between himself and his son. The name "Our Garment" would presumably reveal the fact that this son is his outward form, whereas the designation of "Our

[1] See e. g. BRANDT, *Die Mandäer*, p. 25. BOUSSET, *Die Religion des Judentums*, p. 328, has rightly observed that there are indications that, from the outset, Gabriel was the highest angel, but later had to cede this place to Michael. BOUSSET has pointed to the rôle played by Gabriel in the birth-legends, where he actually represents the deity, see WIDENGREN, *RoB* VII/1948, pp. 26—37.

[2] The same notion and term as in the doctrine of Mani is already pointed out by POGNON, *Inscriptions Mandaïtes*, p. 185, n. 1. My tentative comparison with the Ras Shamra text *SS* 1—2 (23—24) in *The Great Vohu Manah*, p. 20 n. 1, is to be left out of consideration, because *ʾkr'n* there with perfect certainty means "I invoke"; see, in this connection, also GORDON, *Ugaritic Literature*, p. 58 f. In PETERMANN, *R. Ginzā*, p. 291: 2 from below, there is a false writing וקריתא.

[3] As to "the crown of victories", cf. WIDENGREN, *Mesopotamian Elements*, p. 42, n. 2 and references.

[4] Text:

כד האלין פיגדאמיא שומא חייא
אבאהאתה מן יאוּאר זיוא ביסמאת
עלאיאיתון אבית חיאמינון אשאדיון
עלה כליל זאבאיאתא תראצלה
ברישה מן מאדיחתון פרישלה
וקיריויא לבושאן ומאלאלאן
ועתיקריא חי מאלאלא דהייא

For מאדיחתא < מדעתא, see NÖLDEKE, *Mandäische Grammatik*, § 17, § 110, p. 129.

Word" clearly denotes the fact that Yāwar is the word of revelation of his father. In a way, he has thus been given "a name that is above all names" (Phil. 2: 9).[1] The ancient pattern from Mesopotamia is in this case equally well preserved as in the passage where Ptahil-Uthra is elevated to the position of "the Apostle".

Of equal or perhaps still greater importance for our purpose is another text describing not only the sending out *per se*, but also the ascension combined with the receiving of a commission, and the descent. If, in the former texts, we were from the outset moving within the heavenly world, just like in some Mesopotamian texts, we now pass from this world up to the divine one back again, *i. e.* we find a type of ascension strongly reminiscent of the real royal investiture, as it has been met with repeatedly in the course of our investigation. The text we are going to quote is not enacted like the preceding text in the heavenly realms before the creation, but presupposes the creation of the present world to be already carried out. The text describes a scene when a kind of Logos, living in the lower world ascends to heaven, receives his message, and descends in order to carry out his commission. The type found in this place has, accordingly, a far-reaching agreement with the very literary *topos* that is the focus of our researches.

The text is too detailed to be quoted in full, so we have to content ourselves with an abstract of the contents together with some minor citations. The hero of the narrative is *Dēnānuxt*, surely an Iranian name, and perhaps meaning "speaking in accordance with religion", as has been proposed some time ago.[2] He is aptly called by the translator of Ginzā "ein Mittelding zwischen Mensch und Buch."[3] Dēnānuxt wants to learn where Life is, and Kušṭā, the Splendour and the Light, where Error

[1] Cf. the commentary to this passage given by Dibelius, *HZNT* 11, p. 63. Cf. also Lamy, *Ephraemi ... Hymni et Sermones* I col. 253: 46, عصحا ؛ح حصه حصا ؛لحص ؛لحصا.

[2] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 205, where a reference is given by Andreas to Yt. 5: 18 and Y. 8: 7 as well as to Bartholomae, *Air Wb*, col. 127 *anuxtayaē-*. The first part of the compositum would thus be *dēn*, the second *ānuxt*, with a secondary lengthening of the initial vowel before the nasal sound, for which see Horn, *Neupersische Schriftsprache*, § 3, p. 22, 2.

[3] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 205.

and Truth etc. are. And he also wishes to know where that elevated Man is, who is older and was earlier in existence than the Builder of Heaven and Earth.[1] In other words, he expresses his desire to know the unknown God, the highest God, who is above the creator-god. A being from the upper world, an Uthra called Dīn-Mlīkh-Uthra, brings Dēnānuxt out of his body. Winds and storms carry him upwards through the spheres of the seven (or eight) Watchhouses.[2] At last he arrives at the highest of them, that of Abathur, in a way the ogdoad.

Winds, winds took away Dēnānuxt,
storms, storms led him away,
ladders, ladders carry him upwards
and make him ascend on steps.[3]

[1] We may observe that the question-formula used in this text is in a way reminiscent of the corresponding formula found in a Pahlavi inscription by Kartēr, see HERZFELD, *Paikuli*, p. 91: 17—18, *šnāxt ku vahištē hast u dōšaxvē hast*, "he knew that there is paradise and there is hell." That such a formula ultimately derives from Iranian catechism-formulas would seem to be probable, cf. *Pand Nāmak* with its marked antithetical arrangement. They have apparently found their way into Mandaean writings, and from there penetrated also into Manichaean literature, e. g. ALBERRY, *Manichaean Psalm-Book* II, p. 221: 17—18. See further SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH, *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book*, pp. 147 ff., where more Mandaean illustrations are given.

[2] For the idea of the "watchhouses", cf. BRANDT, *Die mandäische Religion* p. 41; *Die Mandäer*, p. 40 f.; BOUSSET, *ThR* 20/1917, p. 197 f.; SCHOU-PEDERSEN, *Bidrag til en analyse*, pp. 122 ff.; WIDENGREN, *Mesopotamian Elements*, p. 35. It is a common conception in Mandaean religion that these watchhouses are places of punishment, where the soul, during its ascent to heaven, is able to see how the unrighteous souls are punished. Such descriptions are found in LIDZBARSKI, *Ginzā*, pp. 183 ff., 443 ff. For commentaries upon these texts see BRANDT, *JbPTh*, XVIII/1892, pp. 408 ff.; REITZENSTEIN, *Das Mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse*, pp. 80 ff.; LIDZBARSKI, *ZS*, II/1924, pp. 181 ff. In the relation of Dēnānuxt's ascension, however, we observe that the stress is not laid on the punishments of the soul. The question has some importance for the Islamic *miʿrāǧ*-literature, and we shall revert to this topic in the second part of these researches. The expression found in the sequel of the narrative, LIDZBARSKI, *Ginzā*, p. 210: 15—17: "I made thee pass the seven Watchhouses of Death, and for the eight of destruction thou hadst no terror or anguish", exhibits a mode of speech which is idiomatic in ancient West-Semitic poetry; see GORDON, *Ugaritic Handbook*, p. 107, § 13. 107, 110, § 13. 128, cf. p. 34, § 7. 7.

[3] As to the notion of the heavenly ladder, we should compare the texts quoted by EDSMAN, *Le baptême de feu*, pp. 49 ff., esp. p. 51, where we find

They make him ascend and erected him[1] in the Watch-house of Abathur,
the old, the high, the hidden and the preserved one.
I was looking and seeing:[2]
thousands upon thousands who were standing,
and myriads upon myriads who were sitting.
All of them clad in splendour and covered in light.
A crown of victories was put around their heads.
They were sitting on thrones of rest
and were reciting from 'chants' and masses and prayers of secrecy.
I was looking out and seeing:
thousands upon thousands of thrones that were set.
Folded and spread over them were
stolae of splendour and pure turbans of light.

Right Ginzā, ed. Petermann, p. 210: 5—14 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 210: 3—13.[3]

"ladder", סלקא, and "steps", דרגא, exactly corresponding to our text, where we have "ladders", סיבליא, and "steps", דיגיא. This exact correspondence is not noted by Edsman.

[1] For the expression "erect", see Lidzbarski, *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. XXIII, and Widengren. *RoB* V/1946, p. 45.

[2] For מיסתכינא (from סכא), see Nöldeke, *Mandäische Grammatik*, § 193, p. 266 above.

[3] Text:

זיקיא זיקיא נאסבי לה לדינאנוכת
עידאמיא עודאמיא מדאבריל֗ה
סיבליא סיבליא סאבלי֗ל֗ה
ועל דיגיא מאסקי֗ל֗ה
אסיק אקמיא על מאטארתא דאבאתור
אתיקא ראמא כאסיא ונטירא
מיסתכינא והאזינא
אליה אלי֗ה דמיקאם קאימיא
וריבאן רובאן דמיתיב יאתביא
כולחון לבושיא זיוא ונהורא מכסין
כליל זאכאיאתא בריש־איהון תריצלון
יאתביא על כארסאואתא דניאתא
ומישתאיין בסידריא ומאסקאתא ובאואתא כאכיאתא
מיסתכינא והאזינא
אלי֗ה אלי֗ה דארסאיאתא דתריציא
עפיפיא ותאהתיא עלאויאיהון
עוצטליא דזיוא וטארטבוניא דאכייא דנהורא

Dēnānuxt is terrified and the accompanying Uthra, Dīn-Mlīkh, asks what he has seen that brings him terror. Dēnānuxt first repeats the description of the court in the heavenly world, but then adds:

I saw the Life that was from the beginning,
and I saw the Kušṭā that was first in the origin.
And he said to him:
I saw Ḏeath and I saw Life,
I saw Darkness, I saw Light.
I saw Error, I saw Truth.
I saw destruction, I saw building.
I saw blowing, I saw healing.

Right Ginzā, ed. Petermann, p. 210: 24—211: 4 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 210: 25—30.[1]

But what has obviously most of all frightened him, is that he has seen the unknown Godhead:

I saw that Man who is older
and who is more ancient as to origin
than the builder of Heaven and Earth.

Right Ginzā, ed. Petermann, p. 211: = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 210: 30—31.[2]

After a dialogue between Dīn-Mlīkh and Dēnānuxt in which the later is informed that the thrones are prepared for the souls, the father and mother of whom do not yet exist, Dēnānuxt asks where his own throne is placed.[3] He receives the reply that his

[1] Text:

חזית חייא דהון מן לאקדמיא
וחזית כושטא דהוא מן קודאם ברישא
יאתי-לה
חזית מיתא וחזית חייא
חזית חשיכא חזית נהורא
חזית טעיא חזית שראר
חזית חבילא חזית בניאנא
חזית מהיתא חזית אסיתא

As to the metrical arrangement, see Säve-Söderbergh, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

[2] Text:

חזית חזק גאברא דאתיקא*
דקאשיש מן קודאם
באניא שוביא וארקא הוא

For אתיקא, cf. Dan. 7: 9.

[3] For the conception of the heavenly thrones, cf. Widengren, *RoB* V/1946, p. 43 f., 58, and Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, p. 43 f., to Revel. 4:4.

garment is a *stola* of splendour, his turban of light, his crown from the vine Rwāz, which does not wither and the leaves of which do not fall down.[1] Then Dēnānuxt is given a commission by Dīn-Mlīkh-Uthra — which would seem to be somewhat out of place, for, according to the pattern, it ought to have been the "elevated Man", i. e. the highest God, who existed before the Builder of heaven and earth, who ought to have spoken to him and sent him out with his commission. It is however possible that the "unknown God" is *so* elevated that He could not even be imagined as having spoken to Dēnānuxt.[2] The other possibility is that the redaction of the text has brought some inconsistencies into this passage, as rather often in Mandaean literature. A decision between these two possibilities seems impossible for the present.

Further Dīn-Mlīkh-Uthra said to Dēnānuxt:
Go into the world of the evil ones,
to the place that is altogether kingdoms ...
Proceed into the world, call the call of Life
and teach disciples sixty years and sixty months!
And when thy measure is full for thee, thou wilt come
clothing thyself in thy *stola* of splendour
and covering thyself with thy great turban of light
and they will put around thee thy thriving crown.
Thou wilt sit on thy throne of rest,
reciting from 'chants',

---

[1] As to this passage, Lidzbarski compares his *Johannesbuch* II, p. 214, n. 1, and *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 108: 1; 243: 10. The crown that is twined of leaves is of course of the same character as that worn by the baptizand in the Syrian church; it belongs to the baptismal rites; cf. Widengren, *RoB* V/1946, pp. 49 f., 52 ff.; Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, pp. XLII ff.; James, *Christian Myth and Ritual*, pp. 163 ff.; Bernard, *The Odes of Solomon*, p. 45 f. Essential passages are found in Lamy, *Ephraemi Hymni et Sermones* I, col. 111: 11, and Diettrich, *Die nestorianische Taufliturgie*, p. 49.

[2] It must however be conceded that the last supposition does not coincide with the general trend in Mandaean literature, where the highest God is so often introduced speaking to the Messenger (the Apostle) and giving him his commisslon, cf. the text quoted above, p. 59, and those cited below, p. 70 f. In the *Testament of Levi*, Ch. 2, we found that the accompanying angel handed over the commission. For this reason it would be rather tempting to assume a certain type of this character, cf. above, p. 36.

and masses and prayers of secrecy,
between the Uthras, thy brethren, the sons of Light.
Right Ginzā, ed. Petermann, p. 211: 15—22 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 211: 3—12.[1]

Dēnānuxt carries out this commission which — as shown by a comparison with other Mandaean texts — is the special message given to the Apostle.[2] In this connection we may also call attention to the fact that Mani had come to "call a call in the World":

I am come from the land of Babel,
that I might call a call in the world.
M 4: 8—10, Müller, *HR*, p. 51 = Salemann, *MS* II, p. 4.[3]

New, and giving the Mandaean text its specific Gnostic colour, is the promise that the Apostle, when he has brought his message of salvation into the world and acquired disciples, will be allowed to return to heaven. This time his ascent will be definite so that he will be given his crown, his garment and his throne. We may note also the saving knowledge communicated to the Apostle at his ascension. He wanted to obtain an answer to

[1] Text:
ואמרלה דין מליך עותרא לדינאנוכת אמרכה
עזיל לאלמא דבישיא
ולאתרא דכולה מאלכאותא ...
פיק לאלמא קריא קאלא דחייא
ותארמיד תארמידיא שיתין שניא ושתין יאהריא
וכה שאלימלאך כילאך אתית
לאבשיתי עוצטלאך דזיוא
ומכאתי טארטבינאך רבא דנהורא
ותאריצלאך כלילאך ראיזא*
יאתבית על כנרסיאך דניאתא
מישתאיית בסידריא ובאראתא כאסייאתא ומאסקאתא
בינא עותריא אחאך בניא נהוריא

We should in this place compare the commission given in the *Hymn of the Soul* to the young prince, and the promise that, after having carried out his task, he is to return to his heavenly home. In that document, however, the Saviour's original place is in heaven. The promise of return recurs, *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 222 f.

[2] Cf. such passages as Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, pp. 57 ff., 91: 7 ff.; *Das Johannesbuch*, p. 222 f.

[3] The text: franaft hēm až zamīγ bābēl
ku χrōsān χrōs paδ zambūδīγ.
Cf. Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, pp. 122 ff.

several questions of both cosmological and soteriological nature, indeed, inseperably bound up with each other, as is always the case in Gnostic doctrine. This answer he receives in the highest heaven, when he beholds "the Man who is older than the Builder of Heaven and Earth", the highest God. Accordingly also the ritual moment of imparting wisdom at the meeting between God and the Apostle is preserved here, though not very clearly stressed. Anyhow it is remarkable that this visionary knowledge ("I saw") is of such a nature as to terrify him vastly. If it is the supernatural character of this knowledge, or the terrible things seen by him, or — and perhaps this is the most natural explanation — the vision of the unknown godhead never before seen by a human being, we do not get to know from the text. Anyhow, we are reminded of all the exhortations by the accompanying angel in such reports of vision telling the seer not to be terrified.[1]

To sum up: we here meet with the ascension to the highest heaven, the introduction before the highest God, the receiving of visionary knowledge, the sending out with an apostolic message, and the descent. The enthronement is dislocated: Dēnānuxt is shown the throne and other royal emblems, after which he is promised to return and take possession of them. It would seem that the strong eschatological aspect has required that postponement.

Before leaving this highly instructive text we may present a few remarks concerning the literary form of the narrative. It is built up of sentences objectively written in the third person, interspersed by Dēnānuxt's own reports and dialogues between the acting persons, especially the Uthra Dīn-Mlīkh- and Dēnānuxt. In many respects its literary form is reminiscent of the Enoch literature. In other respects we are above all reminded of certain passages in the Book of Daniel, especially in its seventh chapter.[2]

[1] Sometimes God himself gives the visionary this reassuring exhortation, see e. g. the *Ethiopic Book of Enoch,* 15: 1.

[2] We observe the agreement between the Mandaic text with its

אלה אלה דמיקאם קאימא
ורובאן רובאן דמיתיב יאתבא

and Dan. 7: 10 with its

אלה אלפים ישמשונה
ורבו רבון קדמוהי יקומון

The oriental hyperbolic language in the discription of the heavenly world thus recurs in Da. 7. Presumably it has already older traditions behind it, such as *e. g.* those found in Ez. 1[1].

But we will return to our text in order to see the story's end. When Dēnānuxt has fulfilled his task he ascends again to heaven in agreement with the promise he obtained before descending to the material world.

> When the measure was full for Dēnānuxt,
> and he had gone out from the body,
> they made him ascend to the gate of the House of Life.
> And Dēnānuxt said:
> "Open unto me the gate of the House of Life!"
> Then they opened unto him the gate of the House of Life,
> and lifted up for him the great curtain of Truth.

Right Ginzā, ed. Petermann, p. 212: 21—23 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 212: 4—8.[2]

The text then describes how Dēnānuxt is given the garment, the turban, the crown from the vine Rwāz, and is now standing on the place of Life glorifying the great Life and Mandā ḏHayyē, the Saviour. As a conclusion are cited the words uttered by Dēnānuxt that, in agreement with his own massiqta, all Nāṣorāyē shall undertake such a *massiqtā* and be set up and confirmed.[3] Since these terms are connected with the baptismal rites, the believers as well as the Saviour, the Apostle, when arriving at the dwelling of Life, are purified in some kind of baptism.[4] But here we are mainly concerned with another detail in the ascent to heaven, *viz.* the exhortation to open the gate, uttered by the

[1] They seem to be intimately connected with the accounts of the ascension, and are found in the *mi'rāǧ*-literature, as will be seen in our treatment of this literary category.

[2] Text:

כד שאלימלהּ כילא לדינאנוכת
ומן פאגרא נפאק
אסקיא לבאבא דבית חייא
ואמאר דינאנוכת
פתוליא באבא דבית חייא
האיזאך פתולהּ באבא דבית חייא
ודאלולהּ בר גודא רבא דשראר

[3] For these expressions תראץ and קאיים, see Widengren, *RoB* V/1946, pp. 44 ff., and cf. above, p. 64, n. 1.

[4] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 370: 5—15, and Widengren, *RoB* V/1946, p. 46.

ascending Dēnānuxt. This exhortation is met with also in other Gnostic texts, namely the Baruch-Book by Justin (Hippol. V 26, 14—17), and in the so-called Cyriacus-prayer (*AMS* 3, p. 275).[1] It is also interesting to observe how the entrance into the heavenly sanctuary and the presentation before God is preceded by the lifting up of the curtain, a trait found in another ascension text (*Left Ginzā*, ed. Petermann, p. 8: 7—14 = Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 429: 3—11).[2]

The scene of the sending out of the Apostle of course often recurs in Mandaean literature. Some passages have repeatedly been the object of attention and may be called classical, e.g. the following one from the Mandaean liturgies where Manda ḏHayyē calls Habbšabbā and orders him:[3]

Arise, depart, go, descend to the earth Tibil!

Lidzbarski, *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 175: 6.

After this exhortation the commission is given in the manner that is by now rather well known to us.

Another type of this sending down of the Saviour is found in *Drāšē ḏMalkē*, when the Lord of Greatness says to the First One, his son:

O Son, come, be a Messenger to me,
come, be to me a Porter[4],

[1] Cf. *RoB* V/1946, p. 32 f. The dialogue before the gates between the Saviour and the gatekeeper(s) returns in the description of the descent of the Saviour; see Kroll, *Gott und Hölle*, Index s. v. Dialog. Here, however, we may still find a trace of the original setting in life of this exhortation: the dialogue before the gates of the divine dwelling, cf. Ps. 118: 19—20. This correspondence ought to be further investigated, cf. Kroll, *op. cit.*, p. 67, 254.

[2] In both texts the Iranian loanword *bargōd* is used, on which see Wikander, *MO* XXXVI/1946, p. 6—8 (offprint). I hope to be able to add some viewpoints to this treatment.

[3] For the figure of *Habbšabbā*, The Sunday, cf. Troje *apud* Reitzenstein, *Die Vorgeschichte*, p. 337 f.

[4] The term *sāblā* is found in the account of the Manichaean system given by Theodor bar Konai, see Cumont, *Recherches sur le Manichéisme*, p. 22 n. 5. In the Mandaean context this figure seems to have quite another purport than in Manichaeism. L. Troje, *op. cit.*, p. 337, n. 1, thinks of some parallels in Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa that do not however possess other than rather vague resemblances with the "Porter" in the Mandaean passage, for in the Brahmana it is the question of carrying the sacrificial gifts.

come, a Porter be to me,
and tread down the rebellious earths![1]
Depart to the world of darkness,
in the darkness, where there is no colour of light![2]
LIDZBARSKI, *Das Johannesbuch*, p. 242: 12—243: 1 (text); p. 222: 14—18 (transl.).

Whereas the commission to Habbšabbā has a clearly soteriological colour, the Apostle, being sent down in order to strengthen mankind in their worship of "the Great, Foreign Life", thus has a more "prophetical" character, the commission in the second passage being rather cosmological as to its content. The sending out here reflects the ancient struggle against the Powers of Darkness. The *type or pattern* in itself is the same, but it is used in two different contexts if we lay stress upon the contents of the commission. It is the same contrast as we already found in the Mesopotamian texts, and conceivably the relevant Mandaean passages only reflect the Mesopotamian pattern in this respect, as we have already suggested.

In the Mandaean texts there does not seem to be found the idea that a heavenly book is given to the Apostle (the Saviour) when he is sent down into the world. This is rather astonishing because the Mandaeans in their literature often speak of holy scriptures, both such as belong to themselves and to other religions. They very well know the existence of the Tora of the Jews, which is mentioned repeatedly in their writings.[3] They

---

[1] For this trait see WIDENGREN, *Mesopotamian Elements*, pp. 42 ff.

[2] Text:
בר אחא אשגאנדא חויליא
אחא חויליא כאבלא
אחא כבלא חויליא
זכבישליא אירקיא מארדיא
אסגיא לאלמא דחשוכא
ביחשוכא דציביאנא דנחורא ליחבה

The word ציביאנא is difficult. NÖLDEKE's etymology in *Mandäische Grammatik*, p. 45, § 47, seems a little better than LIDZBARSKI's in *Das Johannesbuch*, p. 222, n. 8. I have also thought of quite simply equating it with زِصْنُا in the meaning of "delight", the verb צבא not being rare in Mandaic; but this proposal is of course highly uncertain.

[3] See LIDZBARSKI, *Ginzā*, p. 25: 15, the Jews make for themselves a book; *Das Johannesbuch* II (p. 76: 8—10, the Jews possess a book of dreams and a

mention the book of Nebo[1], as well as that of Rūhā.[2] In the account of Dēnānuxt, moreover, we meet with the term "memorial book".[3] Of more importance is surely the fact that in Ginzā (Lidzbarski, *op. cit.*, p. 245: 30) mention is made of the "book of books" where in the names of certain men and women are "written and read".[4] With the "book of books" *asfar sidrē*, in this passage must of course be understood the ancient Mesopotamian conception of the Book of Life, which we have met with so frequently both in Israelitic and Jewish religion. It is not always observed that the Mandaeans attach much importance to the existence of holy writings as the vehicle of revelation. The third book of the Right Ginzā is a separate, fairly comprehensive writing called "the first book of the living, first teaching which was from the beginning" (Lidzbarski, *op. cit.*, p. 65: 27 f.).[5] The

book of visions) p. 81: 19—20 (Tora); 134: 20—22; 136: 5—6 (Miryai reads the Tora); 192 f. (Nebo and the Seven have written the Tora and handed it over to Moses, called Mīšā bar Amrā).

[1] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 347: 5; 446: 1—4.

[2] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 230: 2, 5.

[3] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 206 ff. Nebo's memorial book is mentioned, p. 446: 2. The term obviously goes back on ספר דברניא as Lidzbarski, *op. cit.*, n. 1, points out. The Aramaic expression has its Pahlavi counterpart in *aβyātkār* (*ayyātkār*).

[4] See Lidzbarski, *Ginzā*, p. 245: 30. In Mandaic the expression is *asfar sidrē*. The term *sidrā* meets in the passages from *Johannesbuch* quoted in the following. We might be uncertain whether *sidrā* is not a more general term, only denoting what is arranged in a certain order; cf., for this meaning, *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 192: 20, and I, p. 198: 10 (text), where it is said that Nebo and the Seven wrote and arranged in order, סאדרו, the Tora, עיראיתא. In the text of *Ginzā* p. 210: 5 ff., quoted above, p. 66 f., the heavenly host is said to be reciting from *sidrē*, "chants", as we have rendered the word after Lidzbarski. One might also think of "chapters" according to the Jewish סדרין. That these *sidrē* are always thought of as written, would seem to be highly probable in view of several passages in *Johannesbuch*, see below, p. 74, n. 1. The Mandaeans think that the Jewish Tora is arranged in *sidrē*, and imagine the heavenly writings to possess the same arrangement. Nebo and the Seven make a perfect anticreation of the true, heavenly Books. Cf. also the following notes below, p. 73.

For the expression "written and read", see Widengren, *Literary and Psychological Aspects*, p. 60. Cf., in Rabbinic literature, *miḳrā* as contrasted to *miḏrāš*, see e. g. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 407.

[5] Text in Petermann, *R. Ginzā*, p. 68:

סידרא קאדמאיא דשיתא האיתא
קאדמאיאתא דחיואת מן לא קאדמיא.

holy writing is thus, in this case, thought to be a reproduction of the primordial revelation. This revelation is reproduced in a written form, presented in a book. Shum bar Nū, *i. e.* Sem the son of Noah, for the Mandaeans a representative of their community, and a type of the common kind of Mandaean Saviours, is introduced as tempted by the evil powers of the world, whom, however, he successfully overcomes. Among other things he says in his declaration, a kind of confession often recurring in Mandaean literature[1], that he has not forgotten his hidden books: "I do not forget my hidden books and do not possess any longing for their vain song".[2] In the sequel Shum bar Nū complains that one has forgotten his speeches and his books.[3] From hence it would seem to be possible to conclude that the Mandaean

---

As this *sidrā* really comprises a definite Mandaean writing, it seems as if the former must correspond to something written down in a fixed order. The term שיתא properly denotes "talk", cf. Talmudic Aramaic שיחא. It is what is "related" (שיתא from שעא). The first living "talk" existed in the origin of all. We have an Iranian equivalent in Pahlavi *pōryōtkēšīh*, the "first teaching", an abstract noun to *pōryōtkēš*, "adherent of the first teaching", an Avestic learned word in Pahlavi from *paoiryō.ṯkaēša*, *Air Wb*, col. 877. The root *kaēš-* is not to be split up in two; see NYBERG, *Die Religionen des alten Iran*, p. 65. The basic meaning would thus be "to build", both in a literal sense and in that of "to edify". Zarathustra in Yt. 13: 90 is called "the first teacher of the dahyus", *paoiryō.ṯkaēšō dahyunąm*. Mani was opposed to the teaching of the Magi, represented by the technical term in Pahlavi *kēš* < *ṯkaēša*. The false religions are by him styled *kēšān*, and this mode of expression is inherited by his community, see passages as *MirM* II, p. 11 [302]: 22 ff.; p. 20 [311]: 10—11. The religion of the Magi, attacked by Eznik, is called by him *kʿēš*, an Iranian loanword from *kēš*, Eznik II 2. By rights, we ought in this place to follow the important conception of a first teaching in the sense of primordial revelation, but such a task would take us too far away. Anyhow, there seems to be a correspondence between שיתא קאדמאיתא and *pōryōtkēšīh*, in spite of Mandaean polemics against the Magi.

[1] Cf. e. g. such passages as those of *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 63, 67. See, further, the literature quoted by me in *Mesopotamian Elements*, p. 105, n. 2, and BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 378, n. 10.

[2] See LIDZBARSKI, *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 65: 21—23, I p. 62: 3—4 (text). We should compare *Johannesbuch* II, p. 115: 23—25, where it is asked if John the Baptist is to receive the name of "Yāqif of Wisdom" in order "that he might teach the *sidrā* in Jerusalem", דיאליף סידרא בעירושלם, *Das Johannesbuch* I, p. 118: 1. Here, again, we meet with the term *sidrā*.

[3] See LIDZBARSKI, *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 69: 8, I, p. 65: 14—45, דראשאי וסידראי. The same expression: II, p. 68: 11, I, p. 64: 11.

Saviour, the Bringer of Revelation, is thought of as presenting to the material world a revelation hidden in books he brings to mankind. Miryai, who is depicted in the colours of a true Mandaean, is said to be "reading in the Books of Kušṭā", and from here we get the impression that the revealer of the truth is thought of as acquiring his knowledge from the Books of Kušṭā, i. e. the true books, the writings containing the heavenly truths.[1] We have just seen that the Mandaean Saviour claims not to have forgotten his hidden books. And the third book of the Right Ginzā was called "the first book of the living, first teaching which was from the beginning". If we combine these two statements, we ought to find the notion explicitly expressed that from the very beginning there exist books that are conceiled. We at least approach such an idea when we meet, in "The Book of John", the following saying describing the state of cosmos when the material world, the sun, and the moon did not yet exist: "In their coverings the destinies were hidden, hidden and preserved in their books."[2] The Mesopotamian background is in this case clear, and need not detain us. Here we wish to emphasize the fact that in this passage we find the conception of heavenly books, preexistent before creation and containing the destinies which are said to be hidden in them. The books themselves are not explicitly stated to be hidden, but we are obviously very near the idea that both books and destinies are conceiled from sight.

To sum up: we find in Mandaean literature the conception that there exist, before creation, heavenly books containing the

---

[1] See LIDZBARSKI, *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 134: 5—7, I, p. 137: 6—8, "and a book, *sidrā*, is put in her bosom. She reads in the books of Kušṭā and tosses all the worlds", וסידרא בכאנפה תיצלה קאא בסידריא כישטא ומאנדיד לון על כולהין אלמיא. It is the task of the Saviour to shake and wake up the sleeping people of the worlds. The same conception recurs here. For the verb ידד, cf. the description of how Jesus woke up Adam, in the passage given by Theodor bar Konai, ed. POGNON, p. 130: 23—29; or *CSCO*, Script. Syr. II, 66, p. 317: 15—23. Here the corresponding Syriac verb is used, i. e. ܝܕܕ. This as a little addition to my *Mesopotamian Elements*, p. 71.

[2] See LIDZBARSKI, *Das Johannesbuch* II, p. 222: 9—10, I, p. 242: 7—8, text: באלבושאיהון סיגראתא הינון כאסיא כאסיא ונטיריא בסידראיהון

destinies. These books are thought to be hidden. The Saviour has read these books and does not forget what he has read in them. He brings to mankind the primordial revelation contained in these heavenly books. These writings are further called the Books of Kušṭā, a designation marking their character of true revelation. We still possess a Mandaean writing that claims to reproduce this original revelation, and thus to be brought down to the Mandaean community by the Saviour. What is still somewhat uncertain is the problem whether the Saviour brings his revelation from the outset in a written form, or if he brings his message in an oral form, which is later transferred to paper.[1] If the last idea was dominating among the Mandaeans, it would explain the absence in their writings of the idea that the Saviour is given a heavenly book at his meeting with the highest god. In a colophon of the Mandaean liturgies we read of the songs and hymns that several persons had written them down in their proper turns, taking them over each one from his predecessor until we reach one *ašganda*, Messenger, who received them from Zazai. Of this Zazai it is said: "Zazai had copied them from the leaf of the First Life".[2] It seems difficult however to make much out of this colophon because of its date which must be considerably later than that of the songs themselves. In this case foreign influences, later than the building up of the Mandaean community, cannot be excluded from our considerations. Nevertheless this colophon is of some interest by showing that the Mandaeans anyhow possessed the idea of an original revelation received from the Divine Book of the Godhead and communicated to the first bringer of this revelation, he who has brought it to paper. This idea fits quite well the Jewish-Samaritan conceptions already referred to. Finally we should emphasize that the Saviour is

[1] That a Mandaean *literature* must have existed at a much earlier date than was hitherto assumed, is demonstrated by SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH, *Studies in the Coptic Manichaean Psalm-Book*, pp. 155—163, where he has shown that the so-called Thomas-psalms, forming a part of the Coptic psalm-book, are only a Manichaean adaptation of Mandaean poems already existing. This process would seem to be dependent upon the existence of a *written* Mandaean collection, at least in the third century A. D.

[2] See LIDZBARSKI, *Mandäische Liturgien*, p. 231: 8, וזאזאי אנסא מן שאפתא דחייא קאדמאייא.

expressly called either Messenger, אשגאנדא, or Apostle, שלידא. These two terms have thus preserved their original meaning in Mandaean religion.[1]

[1] See even WIDENGREN, *Mesopotamian Elements,* p. 77, n. 1, and p. 89 with n. 1. Cf. further, p. 173 f., where the Syriac material is presented in a very abbreviated form.

Chapter V

Hermetic-Gnostic Literature in the Arabic Language

Hitherto we have tried to trace the development of the idea of an Ascension of the Sent One and his receiving the Heavenly Book (or Tablets), and this in a line more or less directly descending from Sumero-Accadian culture in ancient Mesopotamia through Israelitic religion down into Jewish, Samaritan, and Mandaean circles. But — and this we should ask ourselves — do we not, beside these more or less direct descendants of the ancient Mesopotamian pattern, find traces of the same scheme outside Israelitic-Jewish religion and its offshoots of various kinds?

Actually we do. At least some characteristic traits are met with in Hermetic writings in the Arabic language.[1] In them we sometimes find, in clear Gnostic-alchemistic surroundings, a literary *topos* of a highly fixed form.

We may begin with the so-called *Tabula Smaragdina* in its Arabic guise, where we read:[2]

> Concerning what the priest Sāğiyūs from Nābulus has dictated about his (i. e. Balīnās) entering the dark chamber.
>
> He says: I have found these words of wisdom at the end of the *Book of Balīnās*, the sage:

[1] A survey of this literature is given by Massignon in Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste*, pp. 384—400.

[2] See the Arabic text and German translation in Ruska, *Tabula Smaragdina*, pp. 112—114. Arabic text of the passage quoted:

فى ما ملاه القس ساجيوس النابلسى عند دخوله السرب المظلم قال قد اصبت هذه التحكمات فى اخر كتاب بليناس التحكيم. لما دخلت السرب المعمول عليه الطلسم. وصلت الى شيخ قاعد على كرسى ذهب وبيده لوح زبرجد. واذا فيه مكتوب بسريانى بلسان الاول. فيه تفسير صحيح لا يشك به.

When I had entered the chamber over which the talisman was set, I came upon an old man sitting on a throne of gold, a tablet of emerald being in his hand. And behold, on it was written in Syriac, in the primordial language:

In it is a correct explanation which one cannot doubt.

(Follows a metaphorical and mysterious description of the philosopher's stone.)

Certain details in this description are of profound interest to our investigation. The entering sage Balīnās[1] finds an old man in the chamber sitting on a throne of gold. This enthroned person has in his hand a tablet of emerald.[2] The tablet is written in Syriac, a language said to be the primordial tongue. Hence, what is written must be understood as a kind of primordial revelation.

To the text just quoted, another is to be compared which approximately exhibits the same scheme.[3] It is called the *Book of Apollonios, the Sage, on the Causes.* This writing contains a self-presentation of Apollonios, who then proceeds to describe how he came across a mysterious book containing all the secrets of nature. At the exhortation of his own higher *ego* he seizes this book.[4] The relevant passage runs:[5]

Then I entered the chamber, and behold, I met with an old man sitting on a throne of gold, a tablet of green emerald

[1] That is Apollonius of Tyana, see RUSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 78; FESTUGIÈRE, *op. cit.*, p. 197, n. 2, 395 (MASSIGNON).

[2] Cf. *OECJ* I, p. 35: 48—49, where the ancient tablets written by Narām Sīn are read by Nabonid. These tablets are made of gold, lapis lazuli and carnelian. Actually tablets of gold have been found in the excavations.

[3] Published and translated by RUSKA, *op. cit.*, pp. 132 ff. Cf. MASSIGNON, *op. cit.*, p. 395 f.

[4] For the higher *ego* in this text as reflecting the Iranian *grīv* (*grīwā*), or *dēn* (*daēnā*), cf. REITZENSTEIN, *SAS*, p. 75.

[5] Text: ثم دخلت السرب فاذا انا بشيخ قاعد على كرسيّ من ذهب وفى يده لوح من زمرد اخضر مكتوب فى ذلك اللوح هذا صفة الطبيعة وبين يديه كتاب مكتوب فيه هذا سرّ الخليقة وعلم علل الاشياء فاخذت الكتاب مطمئناً ثم خرجت من السرب فتعلمت من الكتاب سرائر الخليقة وادركت صنعة الطبيعة وتعلمت علم علل الاشياء وارتفع اسمى بالحكمة وعملت الطلسمات والعجائب وعملت مزاجات الطبائع الاربع وتراكيبها. RUSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

being in his hand: It was written on this tablet: This is the description of nature. And before him there was a book in which was written: This is the *Secret of Creation* and the *Knowledge of the Causes of the Things*.[1] And I seized the book, being perfectly quiet.[2] Then I went out from the chamber. And I learnt from the book the secrets of creation, and attained to the technique of nature[3], and learnt the knowledge of the causes of things. My name was famous on account of wisdom, and I fabricated the talismans, and worked the miracles, and effected the mixings of the four natures, and their compositions, and their differences, and their connections.

In this text there is not only a Tablet giving the description of nature, but also a Book containing the *Secret of Creation* and the *Knowledge of the Causes of the Things*. It is not quite conceivable what this Book has to do here, in view of the fact that there is already a Tablet describing the essence of nature; and for this reason it would be tempting to advance the hypothesis that, originally, there was only a Tablet — as in the *Tabula Smaragdina* — to which later the Book was added, perhaps when tablets were becoming obsolete as vehicles of writing. By the way, we note that the contents of this mysterious book, to judge from its name, must be identical with that of a well-known Hermetic piece of writing, the *Sirr al-ḫalīḳah*, the *Secret of Creation*.[4] We notice that Apollonios, by means of his reading in this secret book, claims to possess all knowledge of the whole universe, and to have become famous on account of his wisdom.

---

[1] On the title *Sirr al-ḫalīḳah, the Secret of Creation*, see MASSIGNON, *op. cit.*, p. 395 f. On the *ʿIlal al-ašyāʾ*, ib.

[2] As RUSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 139 n. 3, rightly remarks: "Apollonios war ja von seinem Geistwesen dazu aufgefordert worden."

[3] RUSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 125, gives *ṣanʿat al-ṭabīʿah*, "Darstellung der Natur", and on p. 139 he translates "erreichte die Darstellung der Natur". But it seems rather enigmatical that one could attain the *exposition* of nature. In view of this it is preferable to adopt the translation "art, technique" (so also MASSIGNON who has, however, the vocalization *ṣunʿat*, *op. cit.*, p. 395). The magician, by means of his supernatural science, acquires the technique of mastering all nature.

[4] For the relation between the titles *Sirr al-ḫalīḳah* and *ʿIlal al-ašyāʾ*, see PLESSNER, *Neue Materialien*, p. 92, who assumes that the second title is due to the editor, whose existence has been recognized by RUSKA, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

We recognize both this superhuman knowledge and the claims of him who pretends to be its possessor.[1]

As to the framework of the *Tabula Smaragdina* and the *Book of Apollonios, the Sage*, it has been correctly observed that the entering of a dark, subterranean chamber in order to find a book of revelation is a theme often recurring in Egyptian and Hellenistic tales.[2] It is perfectly clear that Egyptian conditions and conceptions have coloured and dominated the elaboration of the setting in life of these tales, for only in Egypt do we meet with the idea of a descent into an underground edifice in order to acquire the unsurpassed wisdom of preceding ages.[3]

It has further been rightly emphasized that, in this literature, descent into the nether world and ascent to heaven always correspond.[4] For this reason it is not at all astonishing to see that

[1] Cf. above, pp. 14 f., 31 f., 37, 65. Note that Simon Magus is called a "magician" and looked upon as such because he possesses a supernatural knowledge due to which he can surpass the ordinary boundaries of nature. Simon Magus is stigmatized a wizard by orthodox Christian believers, and viewed with horror mixed with contempt. Apollonios, on the other hand, in the text quoted above boasts of having been famous for his secret power and faculties. Here in a nutshell the difference between *religious* and *magic* attitude presents itself.

[2] See Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 113 with n. 1; *Alchemistische Lehrschriften*, pp. 76 ff.; Boll, *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis*, p. 136 f.; Ruska, *Tabula Smaragdina*, pp. 61 ff.; Festugière, *op. cit.*, pp. 319 ff.

[3] So Reitzenstein, *Alchemistische Lehrschriften*, p. 79 f. As a special illustration, we may mention the Arabic Hermetic *Kitāb al-falakīyah al-kubrā* (on which cf. Massignon, *op. cit.*, p. 394) which is said to have been deposited by Hermes in an underground cave, see Blochet, *RSO* 4/1911, p. 52.

[4] Reitzenstein, *op. cit.*, p. 80 n. 2: "Wohl entsprechen sich in dieser Literatur Himmelswanderung und Unterweltswanderung beständig, aber erstere ist iranisch, letztere ägyptisch," Here he also recalls the seven-towered ladder in the Mithras-mysteries, corresponding to seven ladders, ascending to the place of torment, in an alchemistic writing (Berthelot, *Alchimistes grecs*, Textes, p. 115), and even the story of Dēnānuxt with its five stations. In this place Reitzenstein obviously neglects the fact (although it was, of course, well known to him) that the *seven* steps correspond to the seven planetarian spheres, *ṭubuḳāti*, and accordingly have their origin in a Babylonian culture, whereas the Iranian view of the heavenly spheres is always tripartite: stars, moon, and sun. This essential difference was already noted by Bousset, *Himmelsreise der Seele* in *ARW* IV/1901. The ascent to heaven, moreover, is not exclusively Iranian as to its origin, as Reitzenstein contends, but recurs, as shown above, pp. 7 ff., also in Mesopotamian religion, a province rather neglected by Reitzenstein.

the literary *topos* that has engaged our interest in this chapter is found also in the description of an ascent to heaven. The so-called Krates-Book relates how Krates is elevated to heaven, where he has an experience of the same kind as Apollonios.[1]

> And behold, an old man, the most beautiful of men, sitting on a throne-stool and wearing white garments, in his hand a shining tablet[2], containing a writing.[3] . . . And I inquired about the old man, and it was said to me: this is Hermes Trismegistos.

This text presumably provides us with the right clue to the understanding of the two preceding Hermetic passages that we have quoted above. Those must be explained from this, the third text. The encounter with the old, enthroned man, clad in white garments and holding the tablet with the writing, takes place, in our last text, in heaven, after the ascension of the visionary Krates. For the old man, dressed in white and sitting on the throne, we may compare the description of God given in Dan. 7: 9.[4] This fact should conceivably point in the direction of the old man's being from the outset none other than God himself. But later, in Egyptian-Hellenistic speculation, Hermes has taken the place of God, Hermes himself being in these late epochs a rather composite deity. He is neiter God nor Man; he is the bringer of divine revelation who, after completing his

---

[1] See RUSKA, *Arabische Alchemisten* I, pp. 16—24, where an excerpt in translation from this writing is given. The passage that especially concerns our investigation is communicated also in *Tabula Smaragdina*, p. 52.

واذا رجل شيخ اجمل الرجال جالساً على منبر عليه ثياب بياض وبيده لوح منير فيه كتاب ... فسالت عن الشيخ فقيل لى هذا هرمس المثلث.

[2] See RUSKA, *Arabische Alchemisten* I, p. 17, and n. 6.

[3] Adopting the correction given by BERGSTRÄSSER *apud* PLESSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 82 n. 2, where he translates: "welche ein Buch enthielt." We should note that, in this place, فيه كتاب corresponds to فيه مكتوب in the *Tabula Smaragdina*. For this reason "writing" is perhaps preferable to "book."

[4] Cf. the commentaries by MONTGOMERY and CHARLES on this passage. There are, of course, other traces of the conception of an enthroned deity holding a written tablet in his hand, but they are seemingly of no significance for our purpose, so e. g. the text whose contents are given by BLOCHET, *RSO* 6/1914—15, pp. 43—45.

commissioned work, ascends to heaven. Thus we read in *Kore Kosmou*:

> It is not fitting, my son, that I should leave this report unfinished; I must tell you all that Hermes said when depositing his books. Thus did he speak: 'Ye holy books, which have been written by my imperishable hands, and have been anointed with the drug of imperishability by me who am master over you, remain ye undecaying through all ages, and be ye unseen and undiscovered by all men who shall go to and fro on the plains of this land, until the time when Heaven, grown old, shall beget organisms worthy of you.' . . . Having spoken this prayer over the works of his hands, Hermes was received into the sanctuary of the everlasting zones.
>
> *Kore Kosmou*, § 8.[1]

In this passage we clearly discern the transmutation. The holy books containing the revelation received by Hermes are written by his own imperishable hands, not handed over to him by God at an ascent to heaven. The books are deposited by Hermes before he dies and ascends to "the sanctuary of the everlasting zones." Here the Bringer of Revelation is definitely put within the human sphere.

There are, on the other hand, in Arabic Hermetic writings passages that would seem to betray a confusion between the human Hermes and the divine Hermes. As we have just stated, Hermes had taken the place of God and, accordingly, Hermes himself is the old man sitting on the throne. But when it is related how Hermes enters the dark chamber and meets the old

[1] The text established by Scott, *Hermetica* I, p. 460, is far too much emendated to be acceptable, so I have mainly relied upon that of Stob. Ecl. I, XLIX, p. 117 c ed. Wachsmuth 1, 387 l. 15—388 l. 5.

'Αλλ' οὐ καθῆκον ἀτελῆ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ὦ τέκνον, ταύτην με καταλεῖψαι, εἰπεῖν δ'ὅσα τὰς βίβλους κατατιθέμενος ἐξεῖπειν Ἑρμῆς. Ἐξεῖπε γὰρ οὕτως· "Ὦ ἱεραὶ βίβλοι, τῶν ἀφθαρτῶν αἱ τετεύχατέ μου χειρῶν, ἃς τῷ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας φαρμάκῳ χρίσας ἐπικρατῶ, ἀσαπεῖς παντὸς αἰῶνος, καὶ ἄφθαρτοι διαμείνατε χρόνοις, ἀθεώρητοι καὶ ἀνεύρετοι γιγνόμεναι παντὶ τῷ τὰ γῆς ταύτης παροδεύειν μέλλοντι πεδία, ἄχρις οὗ γέρων οὐρανὸς συστήματα ὑμῶν ἄξια τεκνώσεται, . . ." Τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν τὰς βίβλους [καὶ] τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ κατευξάμενος ἔργοις ἰδίαις τεμενίζεται ζώναις.

man with the tablets in his hand, then the confusion between two types is apparent.[1]

Anyhow, the contrast between *Kore Kosmou* and the Arabic writings where Hermes comes across the old man, on the one hand, and those writings where Hermes *is* this old man is striking. The last type can perhaps be located. In Syria there may have existed, probably in Charran[2], a circle of Hermetics, among whom Hermes Trismegistos had preserved his divine position, and was conceived of as a god, enthroned in heaven with the Holy Book contained in the Tablet in his hand. Witness of this fact is the *Book of Krates* just quoted. That such a circle for whom Hermes was a true God really must have existed in Syria would seem to be proved by a certain detail in the *Tabula Smaragdina* that actually points to Syria, *viz.* the statement that the tablet of emerald was written in Syriac which is said to be "the primordial language", *lisān al-'awwal*.[3] In this connection it is also important to note the curious fact that Arabic tradition records a certain Hermes, a Babylonian, who is placed immediately after the Great Flood, and who saved the ancient Wisdom, describing the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things. After the Flood these scriptures were recovered.[4]

[1] This has also been seen by PLESSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 93, where he points out the impossibility of Hermes' and the old man's existing together in the same narrative. This fact, however, might be explained, as we have tried to do here, by assuming a confusion of two different opinions of Hermes', one taking him for a human being, the other for divine, one holding him to be the *bringer* of revelation, the other the *bestower* of it. As to the Hermetics of Charran we should observe that they apparently thought Hermes to have ascended to heaven, *al-'ālam al-rūḥānī*, in order to be a divine nature; see Šahrastānī, ed. CURETON, p. 233: 2 from below = HAARBRÜCKER II, p, 50. In this case it is perhaps possible to argue that Hermes' ascension to heaven is of the same type as that of Dēnānuxt after death, see above, p. 69.

[2] On Charran as the centre of the Hermetic Gnostics, see CHWOLSOHN, *Die Ssabier* I, pp. 139 ff., 301 ff.; RUSKA, *Tabula Smagdarina*, p. 40 f., and in general *EI* s. v. *al-Ṣābi'a* with bibliography.

[3] See above, p. 78. In the second part of these investigations we meet with a relation of a heresiarch's ascension who is adressed by God in *Syriac*; see al-Naubaḫtī, *Kitāb firaḳ al-šī'ah*, ed. RITTER, p. 34: 7. On the Syrian nationality of the Gnostics in Charran, see CHWOLSOHN, *op. cit.*, pp. 159 ff.

[4] See PLESSNER, *op. cit.*, p. 94, n. 4, with reference to Ibn al-Ḳifṭī, *Ta'rīḫ*, ed. LIPPERT, p. 346. As PLESSNER remarks, this fact explains that, in the book called *Kitāb ḏaḫīrat Aliskandar*, Hermes is said to have deposited the

Here Hermes is again placed within the human sphere, but he is a Babylonian, a fact revealing a possible connection between this tradition and Charran in northern Mesopotamia. A certain amount of indigenous Syrian traditions behind the figure of Hermes may accordingly be assumed.

Thus, to sum up the result of this little investigation, we think we may claim that there are indications of Hermetic Gnostics in Syria having preserved the pattern of the ascent to heaven undertaken by the Bringer of Revelation, and his receiving the heavenly writing, containing all the secrets of heaven and earth, and of this pattern later on being coloured by Egyptian notions of the Book buried in the underground tomb. It is well worth stressing the importance of the revealed knowledge being of a superhuman kind, embracing all the secrets of creation and the causes of nature. The ancient "mystery of heaven and earth" thus recurs repeatedly throughout the ages, at last also among the alchemists of the Islamic epoch. We should also observe that among the Gnostics of Charran the title of "Apostle", *rasūl*, was preserved during Islamic times, as will be noted in the second part of these investigations.

As a kind of concluding remarks we may here add some observations on the corresponding ideas in Islam. It is, for instance, interesting to note that, according to the Qur'ān, both Mūsā (S. 2: 50; 7: 138 ff. etc), John the Baptist (S. 19: 13), and Jesus (19: 31; 3: 43) received a heavenly Book. Also David received a writing, *zabūr*, the Book of Psalms (S. 17: 57), a fact showing how strongly the pattern influenced the Jewish traditions on which Muḥammad was in this respect dependent.

But in Islam not only Muḥammad but a great many sectarians within Shī'ah claimed to have ascended to heaven and to have

---

wisdom possessed by mankind before the Flood in a hiding place at the sea, *al-sarab al-baḥrī*; see RUSKA, *Tabula Smaragdina*, p. 72 (text), and p. 78 (transl.). The wisdom was written down by Hermes, who lived at that time. This tradition reminds us, however, of the fact (not hitherto noted in this connection, as it would seem) that, according to Berossos, the Flood-Hero Xisuthros had in Sippar hidden the writings describing the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things. After the Flood these scriptures were recovered; see SCHNABEL, *Berossos*, p. 264—266, where an excerpt from Alexander Polyhistor as contained in Eusebius, *Chronicon*, ed. KARST, p. 10: 19—12: 5, is given.

been given a Heavenly Writing. Here Hermetic Gnostic ideas may have played their part. This pattern evidently reshaped also the traditions about Zarathustra and Mani, both of whom, according to Arabic authors, are said to have brought from heaven a holy Book. Everywhere the same scheme is found. In the overwhelming majority of cases, the bringer of the heavenly Book is also furnished with the title of *al-rasūl*, the sent One or the Messenger, i. e. the Apostle. Thus both the pattern of the handing over of the divine Book in a scene of heavenly enthronement and the title given to the bringer of revelation, the possessor of the heavenly wisdom, are preserved from ancient Sumerian times through the intermediation of Jewish, Christian, and Gnostic religions and magic speculation down to Islam and its various sects. It is this development within Islam itself that will be traced in the second part of these researches.

Additional Note No. 1

(to p. 10 f.).

The material for the analysis of the enigmatic word *parṣu* has already been fairly exhaustively presented by Landsberger and Witzel, as indicated above, p. 10, n. 2. A few more references to literature will be given in the sequel. It is not necessary for our purpose to review again all the much discussed passages. For us it will suffice to insist on some main points of the semasiological development, and to add a few observations of a more general character.

First we should note that *parṣu* is something that the gods may have charge of, control, possess, decide, *ḫamāmu*, (etymology disputed, see literature referred to by Weir, *op. cit.*, p. 102, s. v.) in their hands. This has been pointed out by Landsberger. The word *parṣu*, as he has shown, is further technically employed in the following wish:

> The *parṣu* of Samas may be thy *parṣu*,
> like a judge (*daiānu*) lead the countries!
>
> *AOTU* I 4, p. 305: 32—34.

From this passage Landsberger, *op. cit.*, p. 66, concludes that *paraṣ* ^{D}*Šamaš* is a parallel of *daiānūtu*. In other texts there is a parallel of *parṣu* and *tērēti*, e. g. as hinted at above, p. 10 f., in the *Epic of Zū* l. 12 ff., where Zū wishes to possess, *ḫamāmu*, the *tērēti*, and be lord of the *parṣē*, *bēlu parṣē*.

> lul-ki-ma dupšīmāt^{meš} ilāni^{meš} a-na-ku
> ù te-ri-e-ti šá ilāni^{meš} ka-li-šu-nu lu-uḫ-mu-um
> lu-uk-kín-ma ^{isu}kussā^{a} lu-be-li par-ṣi
>
> *CT* XV, 39: 12—14.

In this passage Zū accordingly utters the wish to seize the *dupšīmāti*, to handle the *tērēti*, and to be the lord of the *parṣē*. The notions of *dupšīmāti*, *tērēti* and *parṣē* must hence be interchangeable ideas. Even Landsberger, *op. cit.*, p. 66 n. 3, here observes that *tērēti* and *parṣē* must have a similar meaning on

account of the parallel use of both words in connection with *ḫamāmu*.

As to the use of *ḫamāmu* in connection with *parṣu*, we may also compare the epithet En-me-ur$_4$-an-na (*bēlu ḫāmim parṣi šamē*), *CT* XXIV 50: 4; Tallqvist, *Akkadische Götterepitheta*, p. 304.

To return to the text in *CT* XV, 39, we find there that lines 12—14 correspond to passages 20—21, and 47—48 (which supplement each other). Here the realization of Zū's wish is described:

[dupšīmāti^{meš}] ik-šú-da ḳa-tuš-šú
[^{D}En-lil-ú-ta]m il-te-ki na-du-ú par-ṣi
CT XV, 39: 47—48.

The possession of the *dupšīmāti* thus implies the *nadū parṣe*. A comprehensive expression for *dupšīmāti*, *tērēti*, and *nadū parṣē* is found in the word *enlilūtu*, "the Enlilship." That Landsberger is right when stating that "man sich die *parṣē* durch Symbole veranschaulichte" goes without saying, for, as we see, the symbols of the *parṣē* are even the *dupšīmāti*. But it is indeed hardly possible to endorse his translation for *nadū parṣē*: "liegen die *parṣē* danieder", ib. As is well known, *nadū* is often used in the meaning of "throwing" with a concrete thing as the accusative object. The situation in the *Epic of Zū* would seem to be quite clear: by seizing the tablets of destiny Zū disposes of the fixing of the destinies by means of casting the *parṣē*. There is one passage in Harper, *Letters*, 406, Obv. 6 ff. = Waterman, *RCA* I, p. 282, to which Witzel has drawn attention: *ina elī epāše ša ḳarēti ša šarru bēlī išpuranni parṣi ilḳi ina arḫi annē ṭāba ṭāba ḳarētu ana epāše*. Here it seems impossible not to accept Witzel's position. He points out that the sender of the letter has carried out a rite by means of which he is capable of saying whether it is good or not to make a granary during this month. This rite is called *parṣa leḳū*. Then the translation of *parṣa leḳū* as "to take the lots (oracles)" presents itself, cf. Witzel, *Or* 2/1933, p. 209. We should observe how well this wording, *parṣi ilḳi*, agrees with *nadū parṣē*. The second expression describes the act of *throwing* the lots, the first the whole action and its result, the *taking* of the lots, i. e. the consultation of the oracles.

When speaking of the letters, we may also mention some pas-

sages where the meaning "command", "decree" for *parṣu* seems fairly certain. Harper, *op. cit.*, 65, Rev. 10—13 we meet with the expression *parṣē ša ilāni šullumu epēšu*, Waterman, *op. cit.*, I, p. 46. In Harper, *op. cit.*, 542: 25 = Waterman, *op. cit.*, I, p. 384, the meaning "command" is seemingly rather certain. And in Harper, *op. cit.*, 1215, Rev. 5—10, another meaning than "command" is presumably quite excluded. The divine command or decree is alluded to in Clay, *Miscellaneous Inscriptions*, p. 70, Cylinder of Nabon. l. 26: *paraṣ bēlti*.

We may now return to the text quoted in the beginning from *AOTU* I 4, p. 305. I think we may interpret this passage as meaning: "The decree of Šamaš may be thy decree, like a judge lead the countries!" May he possess the same decree, *parṣu*, as Šamaš disposes of in his capacity of *daiān mātāti*. The supreme *daiānu* Šamaš gives his decrees to the countries, and these decrees are quite fixed. The parallel use of *parṣē* and *tērēti* also underlies this passage.

We may compare a passage from the *Enūma Elish* where the parallel sense of *parṣē* and *tērēti* is quite clear:

šu-ú ki-ma ia-a-ti-ma ^{D}E-a lu-u šum-šu
ri-kis par-ṣi-ia ka-li-šu-nu li-bil-ma
gim-ri te-ri-ti-ia šu-ú lit-tab-bal
Enūma Elish VII, 140—142.

The significance of this passage obviously is that Marduk, given the same name as Ea, is at the same time given the same power as he:

May he be master of the bond of all my *parṣē*,
the totality of my *tērēti* may he bring forth.

In this connection we should note that, like *tērēti*, the term *parṣu* is associated not only with *ḫamāmu* (already mentioned) but also with such verbs as *tamāḫu*, *leḳū* (important for the passage from Harper, *Letters*!) and *kullu*. This was observed long ago; see Landsberger, *op. cit.*, p. 66. For the parallelism *parṣē*: *tērēti* it is further important to note the following expressions:

mukīnat parṣē : *mukīn tērēti*,
for which see Weir, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

Thus, in the passage quoted from *Enūma Elish*, nothing forbids us to take *parṣē* as meaning "oracles", "lots", "ordinances", just as *tērēti*. We may add a reference to the *Verse Account* in col. V 14:

i-bal-lal par-ṣi	He confounds the *parṣē*,
i-dal-la-aḫ te-ri-e-ti	he disturbs the *tērēti*.

By thus troubling the fixed decrees of the gods Nabūna'id clearly introduces the *paraṣ la simātišunu*, the *parṣē* that do not suit the gods, about which the *Cyrus cylinder* speaks, l. 6. In the *Elevation of Ishtar* we find a clear parallelism not only between *tērēti* and *parṣu* (l. 11 as compared to l. 45), but also between *parṣu* and *ūrtu* in l. 45, where Anu says that he gives to Ishtar his weighty *ūrtu* and his *parṣu*. This word *ūrtu* (from *wa'āru*, like *tērtu*, and written with the same ideogram as *tērtu*, Deimel, *ŠL* 2:2, 334:86 a) corresponds to Aramaic אוריתא, law, as does *tērtu* to Hebrew תורה, law. The passage in question then confirms the meaning "decree, law" that often must be given to *parṣu*. It is significant that the text ends with the declaration of Anu that he gives to Ishtar the *ūrtu* and the *parṣu*. These words accordingly must denote the symbols of the world sovereignty, here as well as in the *Epic of Zū*.

As to the different shades of meaning between *tērtu* and *parṣu*, Landsberger, *op. cit.*, p. 66, n. 3, has as his opinion given the following statement: "Während aber *tērtu* (á-agga) sicher ein allgemeiner Ausdruck für 'Kommando, Regierungsgewalt' ist, bezeichnet *parṣu*, da nur von Göttern gebraucht, die 'spezifisch göttliche Gewalt (Funktion)' oder 'heilige Macht'." In this case it is indeed impossible to follow the distinguished scholar. The word *tērtu* from the outset has a very concrete sense meaning "message", "oracular message", "oracle" and also "command"; see the literature referred to by Haldar, *Associations*, p. 207 and add a reference to the letter from Mari published in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy* ed. by H. H. Rowley, p. 102:9; 104 Rev. 24. But not in a single passage where this word is found may we say that it is a general expression of the power of command. On the contrary, it is clearly the command as continued in the oracular message. While the verb *wa'āru* is the base of *tērtu*, the word *parṣu* comes from *parāṣu*. This verb

means, in I 1 to "break off"; in IV 1 to "be broken off"; cf. Kraus, *Altbabylonische Briefe*, II, Glossar s. v. From the same root we also possess *pirṣu*, meaning "breach"; see Kraus s. v. = Aramaic פרצא. Now this root with its basic meaning is obviously common Semitic, for in Arabic we have, as mentioned briefly above on p. 11 n., فرض with the sense of "cut off". In Aramaic פרץ means "break through", or "break off", and the same is the case with the Hebrew פרץ and the Ugaritic *prṣ*. Driver, *JThS* XXIII/1921—22, pp. 72—73; XXXII/1931, p. 365 has argued that two roots are confused in the Hebrew dictionaries, one meaning "break through" and the other "command". But Burney, *The Book of Judges* p. 116 in a short note has drawn attention to the fact that we "have evidence that the sense *divide*, and thence *decide*, runs through the differently modified Semitic root *prs* (*prś*), *prṣ*, *prz*." For the interplay between "break through" and "divide" cf. *šatāṭu*, in I 1 "cut", but in II 1 "penetrate"; cf. further in Hebrew חרץ "cut" *and* "decide". The meaning "cut off", or "break off" would thus seem to be basic in the Semitic languages of the root *parāṣu*. From this primary meaning the secondary sense of "allot" could of course develop as easily in Accadian as in Arabic. To cut off, or to break off is to divide, to allot; cf. in Accadian *zāzu*, "divide" *and* "allot" (in German "teilen" and "zuteilen"). Why it should be "unwahrscheinlich" that the meaning "to allot" could be either common Semitic or developed both in Arabic and Accadian as a convergent phenomenon from a primary meaning "to cut" ("einschneiden"), as Landsberger argues, is actually difficult to understand. As to the fact that *parṣu* is a *faʿl* form, this circumstance could surely not be of any but positive importance in this case, contrary of the opinion of Landsberger; for in Arabic فَرْضٌ, a *faʿl* form means "decree", "divine command". And let us remember that the most famous of all Arabic expressions of "decree", *ḳadr*, also is a *faʿl* form. This argument, then, cannot be said to carry any weight. What is really important, on the contrary, is to note the Ḳurʾānic usage of this root فرض, viz. that it is employed when it is spoken of the commands of God, e. g. S. 9: 60; 28: 85.

From the basic meaning of allot, assign, decree other meanings

have developed. We refer to the treatments by Landsberger and Witzel.

The meaning of the Sumerian word *ME* as the equivalent of *parṣu* has been definitely settled by Witzel, *An Or* 15, p. 90 f. It is "allotment, oracle, lot, place of oracle".

The translation given by Falkenstein in his treatment of *CT* XXXVI 28—30 "göttliche Kraft" (= Landsberger's proposal) does not suit the passages in question very well. Above all it is difficult to see how it can be said to Urninurta:

é-an-⟨na⟩-ka me-bi ḫa-ba-gub-bé
The *me* of Eanna thou mayest place!
CT XXXVI 28: 39 = *ZA* N. F. 15/1949 p. 108

if *me* would denote "divine power". For how can a "divine power" be placed? It surely must be a concrete thing, therefore, that is alluded to in our passage. If we translate *me* with "lot", we gain the necessary coherence in the text.

Another passage is also very significant.

^{D}Inanna ...
sag-íla me-ni-g[alam]-ma mu-un-ur$_4$-ur$_4$ šu-ni-šè mu-u$_8$-gar
Inanna ...
with elevated head the surpassing *me* has collected,
put them in his hand.
CT XXXVI 29: 25—26 = *ZA* N. F. 15/1949 p. 110

It is difficult to translate *me* in this place with "göttliche Kräfte" as does Falkenstein, because the *me* is placed in Ninurta's hand. Assuming "lots" or "oracular allotments" to be the correct translation we get the equivalent expression of *ḫamāmu parṣē*, because *ur$_4$* and *ur-ur* exactly correspond to *ḫamāmu*, see Deimel, *ŠL* 2: 4,575: 86 c *ur-ur* = *ḫamāmu*; *ŠL* 2: 4,594: 5 *ur$_4$* = *ḫamāmu*. Accordingly these expressions in the Sumerian royal poems exactly correspond to the Accadian idioms mentioned in this note and above in the text. The king is given the lots of decision by means of which his sovereignty of the universe is established. By throwing the lots the ruler decides the destinies of the world.

Additional Note No. 2

(to p. 14).

Hyatt has in a well-documented study, *The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian*, discussed the non-pronunciation of case-endings and other final vowels in Neo-Babylonian. As a supplement to this study we should in this place like to offer some remarks on the same subject, the material being taken from the *Verse Account* that was not utilized by Hyatt.

In the passage, col. V ii, quoted above, p. 14, we note the following writings:

Permansive 1 sg.:

en-ḳi-ik
mu-da-a-ka
šu-tu-ḳa-ak

Thus the pronunciation has been: *enḳēk*, *mūdāk*, *šūtuḳāk*.

Preter. III 1, 3 sg. with suffix 1 sg.:

ú-šab-ra-an

Pronunciation: *ušabrān*.

In the *Verse Account* there are other writings worth quoting, e. g. the following:

Suffix 3 plur.:

col. I 9 makkure-šu-nu
bu-ša-šu-un
col. III 5 bu-ša-šu-nu
col. VI 12 ki-iṣ-ṣi-šu-nu
13 aṭ-ma-nu-šu-un
14 ka-bat-ta-šu-nu
16 a-kal-šu-un
col. V 19 it-ti-šu-un

Suffix 3 sg.:

col. I 27 pi-ri-e-tu-uš
31 gat-tu-uš
col. VI 7 lib-bu-uš
col. II 14 zi-mu-šu
col. I 1 (II 22) itti-šu

Treatment of final vowels in Verba tertiae infirmae:

(cf. Hyatt, *op. cit.*, pp. 45 ff.)

banū

col. II, 17, ibnu-u

tebū

col. II, 22 (VI 23, 24) te-bu-u

The pronoun šū:

col. II, 21, 27; V, 21 šu-u

Nouns:

(cf. Hyatt, *op. cit.*, p. 52)

billudū

col. V, 15, bil-lu-di-e

pū

col. V, 25, pu-u

rēštū

col. II, 18, riš-tu-u

Proper names:

Amurru

col. II, 23, ki-rib a-mur-ri-i

Temā

col. II, 23, 25, te-ma-'

For this writing cf. Hyatt, *op. cit.*, pp. 6 ff., 43 f., 55 f.

But in the *Nabonidus Chronicle* we find other writings:

col. II, 5, 10, 23, te-ma-a

col. II, 19, te-ma

This alternative between the Úmun-sign and the vowel-sign is quite in accordance with the results attained by Hyatt. The writing Te-ma in the *Nabonidus Chronicle* must be considered careless, because the other, regular writings with the Úmun-sign or the vowel-sign show the final *-a* to have been pronounced as a long vowel. The transliteration accordingly ought to be Temā, not Tema', as e. g. Smith, *op. cit.*, consistently gives. The form Temā must be a shortened one for Tēmā < Taimā, as indicated by the Arabic, Aramaic, and Hebrew writings.

Additional Note No. 3

(to p. 26).

We may start with a presentation of *TM*, arranged metrically, as we think the text is to be analyzed according to metrical principles.

v. 12 b	מלא חכמה וכליל יפי	אתה חותם תכנית
v. 13 a	כל אבן יקרה מסכתך	בעדן גן אלהים היית
b	תרשיש שהם וישפה	אדם פטדה ויהלם
c	וברקת וזהב	ספיר נפך
d	בך ביום הבראך כוננו	מלאכת תפיך ונקביך
v. 14 a	את כרוב ממשח הסוכך	ונתתיך בהר קדש
b	בתוך אבני אש התהלכת	אלהים היית

Ezekiel 28: 12—14

The textual criticism has not yielded any convincing results in this case. The latest commentary by Bertholet in *HZAT* must be said to go very far towards a complete rewriting of the text. Actually the text is not at all badly preserved. Admittedly there are some difficulties, though these may be overcome without any alteration of *TM*, except in one passage where some supplements after the versions seem absolutely necessary.

As to the metrical analysis we follow the system advocated by Sievers with the modifications brought about by recent research. We thus think the existence of "mixed" metrics and strophes to be perfectly well proved, cf. the survey given by Haldar, *Studies in the Book of Nahum* pp. 10 ff., and for Ugaritic conditions Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook* § 13. 98—161. In our text there are of course some instances where we may hesitate, e.g. if in v. 13 d בך is to be carried to the first or the second half of the stichos. The meaning would seem to decide in favour of the second part. In v. 14 b there is some uncertainty whether בתוך belongs metrically to the first or the second half of the stichos. To judge from the construction of the sentence it ought to be kept together with אבני אש; the metrics would be more smooth if this word were taken to the first part. Because the problem of *enjambement* is still somewhat uncertain it seems safer to put בתוך in immediate connection with אבני אש, the more as we have already decided in favour of "mixed" metrics.

The greatest difference between *TM* and the versions lies in the enumeration of the jewels in v. 13 b—c. In this passage the *LXX* gives the same names as in Ex. 28:17—20, where these precious stones are said to belong to the highpriest's garment, his *pectorale* being beset with them. For reasons developed in my monograph *Psalm 110* pp. 13 ff. I think we must assume that the description given by Ezekiel is right in attributing these jewels to the garment of the king of Tyrus. We are entitled to believe that the Phoenician kings have carried a *pectorale* of the same quadratic form as that born by the Israelitic highpriest (who had taken over this ornament from the king as I have tried to prove). This *pectorale* was beset with 12 stones. Accordingly we ought to add in agreement with the *LXX* the missing 3 stones. This solution has of course often been recommended and is to be accepted for reasons founded on facts.

We may now proceed to a detailed commentary.

v. 12 b: תכנית as was indicated above p. 26 n. 1 is best taken with Haupt as the same word as Accadian *taknītu*, referring to the conception of the "wellpreserved" heavenly tablets. In *Psalm 110* p. 15 n. 2 it was mentioned that in Mesopotamia a divinity may be worshipped as that one who confirms the tablets by the act of sealing them, see *TC* XV Pl. 63 Obv. 12. The versions *LXX* and *Pesh.* have found a corresponding word but apparently read it as תבנית in the sense of "the likeness of God", ὁμοίωσις and ܕܡܘܬܐ (cf. Bertholet *op. cit.* p. 100 *ad. loc.*), already not a translation but an exegesis. The words מלא חכמה have fallen out from *LXX* except in *Codex Marchalianus* that has πλήρης σοφίας, but are preserved in *Pesh.* ܡܠܝܐ ܚܟܡܬܐ, not the only point of contact between these two textual witnesses.

v. 13 a: *TM* is confirmed by the *LXX* and *Pesh.*

v. 13 b—c: As we have indicated above it is necessary to supplement *TM* from the *LXX* and *Pesh.*

v. 13 d: The words מלאכת תפיך ונקביך have always been a *crux interpretum*. Textual criticism however confirms *TM*, for the *LXX* has ἐνέπλησας τοὺς θησαυρούς σου καὶ τὰς ἀποθήκας, corresponding to מלאת etc., and *Pesh.* gives ܡܠܝܬ ܟܠ ܡܚܣܢ̈ܝ ܘܡܙܓ̈ܢ̈ܝ ܟܠ ܡܫܟ̈ܚ̈ܝ, indicating a reading מלא בת תפיך, which is nothing but a corruption in *scriptio continua* of מלאכת into מלאבת. The reading of the *LXX* as not seldom in this place is more corrupt than

that of *Pesh.* But whereas the *LXX* has rendered בך in the second half of the stichos with ἐν σοί *Pesh.* obviously has put בך together with the preceding, interpreting נקבי כבך in a free manner, unless we ought to suppose that its Hebrew text was "overfilled" in this passage. As to the actual translation of this crucial passage we should observe that מלאכת, "work" or "workmanship", is found also in Phoenician, see Harris, *A Grammar of the Phoenician Language*, p. 114 s. v. לאד, and already Gesenius-Buhl, *HW* s. v. מלאכה. The term נקבים is to be kept together with Ugaritic *nḳbnm*, that has a suffixed *-ān*, for which suffix cf. Gordon *op. cit.* § 8. 36 p. 52 f. The meaning of תפיך can only be approximately defined, for Greek θησαυρούς σου and Syriac ܚܣܢ ܕܝܠܟ are apparently nothing but guesses. My translation "setting" is merely a suggestion after *RÉJ* 42 pp. 7 ff., founded upon the assumption that תפ must be something parallel to נקבים, presumably something belonging to a jeweller's work. In the second half of the stichos the word כרננו is missing in the *LXX* except in *Codex Marchalianus* where we find ἡτοίμησαν. Its presence in the original text is confirmed also by *Pesh.* which has ܡܟ ܕܐܬܝ ܘܐܬܝ ܠܗ where ܐܬܝ ܠܗ impossibly can correspond to anything else but כרננו, although it has been carried to the sequel.

v. 14 a: Textual criticism confirms *TM.* Again *Codex Marchalianus* has preserved more of the original text than the other mss. of *LXX*, giving κεχρισμένου τοῦ κατασκηνούντος. *Pesh.* has ܕܡ ܕܣܟ ܘܡܫܚ ܘܡܫܚ which seemingly is only a free translation of את כרוב ממשׁח הסוכך where מ in ממשׁח has been rendered with ܘ and הסוכך taken as an independent noun, for this reason introduced by ο.

The translation of this passage is of course difficult. We still adhere to the proposal given in *Psalm 110*, viz. to understand מ in ממשׁח as an interrogative particle, a particle analyzed by Nyberg, *Studien zum Religionskampf* p. 386 f.; *Studien zum Hoseabuche* p. 62. The words משׁח הסוכך are not to be emendated, for they correspond exactly to the reading of *Codex Marchalianus*, a reading that in connection with the Syriac version gives the clue to an understanding of the enigmatic text. We stress the fact that Syriac ܡܫܚ confirms the Greek κεχρισμένου. The epitheton הסוכך I have previously understood as alluding to the divinity who is expanding its wings, overshadowing the king, cf.

in this connection such passages as Ps. 17:8; 36:8; 57:2; 61:5; 63:8, and the short discussion in Widengren, *Psalms of Lamentation* p. 252 f. For the meaning of the whole passage in Ezekiel cf. further Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré* p. 165 f. where he wants to see in מסכתך and הסוכך two allusions to the pavilion or tent, סֻכָּה. He may be quite right, although the existence of a Phoenician pectorale is undeniable and the comparison with Ex. 28:17—20 points to מסכה being a kind of garment. I hope to be able to revert to the question, adducing some other material. For the expression בהר קדשׁ cf. Is. 11:9 בכל הר קדשׁי in the descriptions of the return of the age of paradise. This is important because in our text the king of Tyrus is said to have been living in the paradise garden. The term is presumably pre-Israelitic.

v. 14 b: Textual criticism confirms *TM.* It is true that the *LXX* does not render התהלכת but *Pesh.* has ܗܘܝܬ. It goes without saying that the word אלהים belongs to v. 14 b and must be kept together with היית, because this statement perfectly agrees with the words of the king 28:2 "I am a god, a seat of the god(s) I sit upon / in the midst of the seas." This rare point of contact of opinions between Bertholet and me ought to be noted, see Bertholet *op. cit.* p. 100.

After these preliminaries we are prepared to give a translation of the text.

Thou wast a sealer of the preserved (thing), full of wisdom and accomplished in beauty.
In Eden, the garden of God, thou wast, every precious stone being thy cover,
ruby, chrysolith, diamond, topaz, shoham, jasper,
sapphire, malachite, beryl, hyacinth, agate, amethyst and gold.
The work of thy settings and thy trappings on thee, the day thou wast created they were prepared.
Thou wast a cherub, oh, what an anointed of the Shadower, and I placed thee on the holy mountain.
A god thou wast, in the midst of stones of fire thou walked.

Ezekiel 28:12—14.

We need not add that the renderings of the Hebrew names of these precious stones are extremely uncertain, in spite of all efforts by previous research to reach more definite results.

Additional Note No. 4

(to p. 27).

In the *Epic of Ishtar's Descent* Obv. 1. 51, Rev. 1. 42 (*CT* XV Pl. 45: 51; Pl. 47: 42) we meet with a word *dudināti*, usually translated "breastplates". It is related how Ishtar takes off (resp. puts on again) these *dudināti* among other garments and ornaments. These articles of dress are called *dudināti ša irti*. Here in this epic *dudināti* is found only in the plural. The singular form *dudittu* is however also met with. The plural form would seem to point to an original sing. *dudintu* > *dudittu* (Muss-Arnolt, *Assyrisch-englisch-deutsches Handwörterbuch* I p. 243 a; Delitzsch, *HW* p. 211 b). Scheil, *RA* 17/1920 p. 213 gave a survey of the various materials out of which the *dudittu* is made; metal (gold, silver), precious stones (lapis lazuli, *uḳnū*, serpentine (green feldspar), *ṣirgarru* (for this reading see Thompson, *A Dictionary* p. 154), ebony or simple wood (*IV R*^{2} 56, III 50 ^{giš}*du-di-it-tu*).

In the juridical literature Ungnad, *Glossar* p. 49 lists the same word under the form *dūdītu*. He has only one reference: *VS* IV 160: 2, *a-di du*(?) — *di*(?) — *ut* — *tum*, a passage by the author himself characterized as "unsicher". This surely being the case it is perhaps not necessary to attach much weight to Ungnad's opinion of the word in question as a form *dūdītu*. In itself it is justifiable to take the word alternatively as *dudītu* instead of *dudittu* on account of the wellknown change: short vowel + geminated consonant ≠ long vowel + single consonant, each alternative giving the same *mora*, either *positione* or *natura* long (this general explanation recommended by Ravn seems preferable to that given by Ungnad, *Grammatik des Akkadischen* p. 69 § 50 d), but *ū* is difficult to understand. This problem raises the question of etymology. Delitzsch wanted to explain the word from دِنْدِنَةٌ plur. دَنَادِنُ "herabhängende Enden eines langen Gewandes." (For his opinion cf. also *Assyrische Studien* p. 122 n. 1.) The problem is however more complicated, partly because it is difficult to understand how such extremities of a garment could be made of metal, precious stones or wood, partly because the same word has appeared under different forms also in Sumerian and Hittite texts.

The Sumerian version of *Ishtar's Descent* in the corresponding passages has *tu-di-tum*. See also above p. 26 where in the text from KRAMER, *Sumerian Literature* p. 297: 23 the Sumerian text has *tu-di-tum*. KRAMER in his edition further refers to *SLT* No. 89, Obv. II 8—9; Rev. III 6—7; 190; Obv. III 16—17, see *RA* 34/1937 p. 120. SCHEIL, *RA* 17/1920 p. 213 *inter alia* referred to LANGDON, *SLT* I p. 133: 37; ZIMMERN, *SK* No. 32: 7, and the El-Amarna letters. SCHEIL gives these references as a commentary to some passages in Sumerian economic documents from Drehem where we find the form *tu-di-da*. He also refers to Hittite texts (*VAT* 743, 8: 8 = *LSS* VII p. 97) where we find the form *tu-ti-id-*[*du*]. We may add to these references *KUB* XI 26 II 6 ff. where the king is said to sacrifice blood of certain animals as libations. Here we meet with the word written *tu-ti-it-ti*, see *ZA* N. F. 15/1949 p. 248 n. 1. Another form from the Kassite epoch is *tu-di-it-ti*, *Museum Journal*, Philadelphia 1920, p. 138, referred to by SCHEIL *op. cit.*

The forms are accordingly:
Sumerian: tu-di-tum / tu-di-da
Hittite: tu-ti-it-ti
Kassite: tu-di-it-ti
Assyr. Babylonian: du-di-it-tu

On account of these various forms of the singular of the plural form *dudināti* SCHEIL suggested an etymology from a root דוד or דיד, either to be connected with the breasts of a woman, or with the fruits of certain plants, Hebrew דודי. He thought that the spheric or half-spheric form of the ornaments, worn on the breast, would have given them a name after the root דיד or דוד. He translated however "pectoral" which does not seem appropriate after his own exposition. For it would seem both more logical and practical to reserve this term for the royal pectoral, the Sumerian *mûš*, treated above p. 26 f., and accordingly to give to *dudināti* the translation "breastplates", assuming them to be borne especially by women. Supplementary details may be expected from OPPENHEIM's forthcoming work *Material Culture*.

To return to the etymology. The constant shift as to the consonant *d/t* would seem to indicate a certain lack of consciousness of the real character of these sounds in the word in ques-

tion. This fact could perhaps be said to actualize the question if not Sumerian *tu-di-tum / tu-di-da* is the base of the word. *Against* a Sumerian origin could possibly be argued that all existing sg. forms may be taken as representing nomin., gen., and acc. of an Accadian noun *d/ṭud/ṭittu(m)*, *d/ṭud/ṭitti*, *d/ṭud/ṭitta*. But the present material seems not sufficient to solve this problem. That much could presumably be said to be quite clear, that in the case of the *dudināti* we have to do with ornaments of another kind than the *múš*. For the question of the royal *pectorale* they apparently are of no relevance, unless new material of a totally different character is presented.

Index of selected words and expressions.

Sumerian.

á-agga ... 89
ḫe-ni-è ... 17 f.
ki(n)-ki(n)-ma ... 19
ki-ur ... 30
me ... 91
múš ... 27, 99 f.
tu-di-tum ... 99 f.
u_4 ... 17 f.
ub-šu-ukkin-na ... 8
ur_4 ... 91
ur-ur ... 91
zi ... 17

Accadian.

alāku ... 34 f.
alik ... 35
allak ... 35
bārû ... 7, 12, 29
bīt rimki ... 21
giparru ... 17
daḫānu ... 86, 88
daḫānūtu ... 86
daḫān mātāti ... 88
dudināti ... 27, 98 f., 100
dudittu ... 98 f., 100
duppu ... 25
duppu adē ... 25
duppi ilāni ... 8 f.
duppi ša nēmēḳi ... 9
dupšīmāti ... 10 f., 12, 24, 26, 86 f.
enlilūtu ... 87
enḳēk ... 92
ḫamāmu ... 86 f., 91
ḫamāmu parṣē ... 91
kiuru ... 30
kullu ... 88
kunukku ... 12
lē'u ... 25
leḳû ... 88
lūṣā ... 17
ma'āru ... 20
mūdāk ... 92
mukīn tērēti ... 88
mukīnat parṣē ... 88
nadû parṣē ... 10 f., 87
narāmu ... 19
našparu ... 19 f.
parāṣu ... 89 f.
parṣu ... 10 f., 86 f., 88 f., 90 f.
paraṣ bēlti ... 88
paraṣ la simātišunu ... 89
parṣa leḳû ... 87
pirṣu ... 90
pitiḳšu ... 15
puḫru ... 8
puḫur ilāni ... 24, 34
ḳabû ... 53
ṣīma ... 17
ṣirgarru ... 98
ša'ālu ... 16
šapāru ... 35
šaprāku ... 35
šatāṭu ... 90
šemû ... 53
šipir ^{D}Ea ... 16
šipir maḫḫē ... 16
šitūltu ... 11, 16, 27
šubat šitulti ... 11
šūtuḳāk ... 92
takāltu ... 9, 11 f., 26
taknītu ... 26, 95
tallakam ... 35
tamāḫu ... 88
tērēti ... 11, 86, 88
tērēti ša ilāni ... 11
tērtu ... 89
tibû ... 17
ṭubuḳāti ... 80
ubšukkinnaku ... 8, 11, 33

ukkina šitkunu 8
ummānum 15
ūmu ..... 17 f.
ūrti erṣetim u šamāmi 9
ūrtu 89
ušabrān 92
wa'āru 89
zāzu 90

Hebrew.

bat kol 31
ᶜēḏūṯ 25
hālaḵ ..... 33 f., 35
ḥaiiīm ..... 44 f.
kᵉrī ḥaiiīm 57
kiyor 30, 46
leḵ ..... 34 f.
lūḥōṯ hāᶜēḏūṯ 25
mamlal ḥaiiīm 57
mᵉsūḵāh 97
miḏrāš 72
miḵrā 72
šālaḥ 31, 33, 35
šālīaḥ 47
tōrāh ..... 25, 28 f.
tāknīṯ 26

Ugaritic.

nḵbnm 96
prṣ 90

Aramaic (Mandaic, Samaritan, Syriac).

aḥḥeṯ 42
asfar sidrē 72
ašgandā ..... 50, 75 f.
attīḳā 65
dargē 64
dirgē 64
gabbarwātā 53
ginzā ḏhaiiē 57
ginzaiihōn ḏhaiiē 57
habbšabbā 70
ḥaiiā ᶜellāiā ..... 49 f.
ḥaiiā ḳaḏmāiā 49
ḥaiiā kasiiā ..... 49 f., 51, 53
ḥailā rabbā ..... 49 f., 52
ḥēl kᵉsaiiā 52
hōṣār 45
ḳāᶜem 44, 49
ḳaiiem 69
ḳaššīṭ 55
ḳrītā 61
kušṭā 55
ḳušṭā 56
madihtā 61
mallālā ḏhaiiē 57
massiḳtā 69
minilat haiiē 57
miniltā ḏhaiiē 57
nabiiā dašrārā 55
nabiiā dᵉḳušṭā 55
nabiiā ḳaššīṭ ..... 45 f., 55 f.
nabiiā ṭāḇā 55
ōraiiṭā 72
ōṣār 55
ōṣār haiiā 57
ōṣar haiiē 57
ōṣar šumaiiā 57
ptā haiiā 59
ptāhil 59
pugdāmā ḏhaiiē 57
rᵉḏaḏ 74
rūḥā dᵉḳušṭā 56
rūḥāfā 53
sāblā 70
seḇlᵉṭā 64
sᵉleḵ ..... 42 f.
siblē 64
sidrā ..... 72 f., 74
sīmaṭ ḥaiiē 57
sīmṭā 45
sīmtā ḏhaiiē 57
skā (mistkēnā) 64
ṣbā 71
ṣᵉḇaᶜ 46
ṣebiānā 71
ṣibiānā 71
ṣōbīᶜai 37
šautā 73
šᵉᶜā 73
šᵉlīḥā (šlīhā) ..... 47, 49 f., 76
šᵉrārā (šrārā) 53, 55

šlīhā kušṭānā 56
šlīhē ḏkušṭā 56
traṣ 69
utrā (ʿuṯrīn) 58

Arabic.

al-ʿālam al-rūḥānī 83
al-rasūl 85
al-sarab al-baḥrī 84
ʿilal al-ašyāʾ 79
lisān al-ʾawwal 83
miʿrāǧ 69
sirr al-ḫalīḳah 79
zabūr 84

Greek.

ἀπεσταλμένος 50
δύναμις 49, 52
ἐστώς ..... 48 f.

Armenian.

kʿēš 73
patgam 57

Iranian.

bargōd 70
βγyynpyk 37
daēnā 78
dēn 78
fraēšta 50
grīv 78
grīwā 78
kēš 73
kristiyān 58
nāṣorāi 58
paδgām 57
paoiryō.ṯkaēša 73
pōryōtkēšīh 73
ṯkaēša 73

Index of Authorities.

Alberry 63
Albright 15, 30
Andræ 41
Andreas 62
Baentsch 22, 24
Bartholomæ 62
Barton 19, 30
Bauer ..... 14 f.
Bedjan 54
Beer 22
Bentzen 9, 32
Bergsträsser 81
Bernard 66
Berthelot 80
Bertholet ..... 94 f.
Bezold 10, 28
Blochet ..... 80 f.
Boll 80
Bornkamm 54
Bousset 9, 33, 40, 51, 61, 63, 80
Brandt ..... 37 f., 52, 61, 63
Budge 10, 28
Buhl 28
Bultmann 56, 73
Burney 29, 90
Buttenwieser 41
Böhl ..... 16 f., 18 f.
Cerfaux ..... 48 f., 51, 55
Charles 28, 31, 38, 81
Chwolsohn 83
Clay 88
Connolly 53, 59, 66
Cowley .... 41 f., 43 f., 45 f., 47, 55, 57
Craig 8
Cumont 70
Cureton 83
Dalman 52
De Faye 48
De Goeje 23
Deimel 12, 19, 30, 89, 91
Delitzsch 10, 16
Dhorme ..... 8, 19, 26, 29 f.
Dibelius 62
Diettrich 54, 66
Driver 90
Dürr 31
Ebeling 29
Edsman 63
Engnell 11
Falkenstein 8, 17, 27, 30, 91
Fascher 28
Festugière ..... 77 f., 80
Frankenberg 51
Frankfort 23
Gadd 19
Gaster ..... 25 ~ 41 (M)
Gesenius 42, 46, 58
Gesenius-Buhl 25, 96
Gesenius-Kautzsch 23
Goetze 12
Gordon 61, 63, 94, 96
Gray 28
Gressmann ..... 22, 28 f., 56
Haarbrücker 83
Haldar 7, 16, 29, 89, 94
Harper ..... 87 f.
Harris 96
Haupt 26, 95
Hausherr 54
Heidel ..... 10 f., 17 f., 34
Heidenheim 41, 46, 48
Henning 37
Herzfeld 63
Hilgenfeld ..... 48 f., 51
Hooke 28
Horn 57, 62
Hyatt ..... 92 f.
Hübschmann 57

Hölscher ... 29
Jacobsen ... 27
James ... 66
Jensen ... 8, 11
Jeremias ... 22 f.
Johnson ... 30
Jonas ... 67
Kaplan ... 59
Karst ... 84
Kramer ... 26, 41
Kraus ... 90
Kroll ... 70
Labat ... 29
Landsberger ... 10, 14 f., 86, 88 f., 90 f.
Lamy ... 57, 62
Langdon ... 8 f.
Layard ... 15
Legge ... 37
Leisegang ... 48 f., 50
Lidzbarski 52, 56 f., 58 f., 60 f., 62 f., 64 f., 66 f., 69 f., 71 f., 73 f., 75
Lindblom ... 34
Lohmeyer ... 12, 28, 33, 65
Lippert ... 83
Luckenbill ... 15
Massignon ... 77 f., 79
Mc Lean ... 52
Meier ... 34
Meissner ... 12, 40
Montgomery ... 32, 41 f., 48, 81
Mowinckel ... 28
Murmelstein ... 28
Muss-Arnolt ... 16
Müller ... 67
Noth ... 30
Nyberg ... 73, 96
Nöldeke ... 58, 61, 64, 71
Pallis ... 8, 29
Pedersen ... 9, 23, 27 f., 33, 47
Petermann 56 f., 60 f., 64 f., 67, 69 f., 72
Plessner ... 79, 81, 83
Pognon ... 50, 61, 74
Ravn ... 14
Reitzenstein ... 58, 63, 70, 78, 80
Riedel ... 22
Riesenfeld ... 9, 24
Rignell ... 53
Ritter ... 83
Robertson-Smith ... 23
Rowley ... 89
Ruska ... 77 f., 79 f., 81, 83 f.
Salemann ... 67
Schollmeier ... 8, 20 f.
Schou-Pedersen ... 63
Schnabel ... 84
Schott ... 8
Schwab ... 38
Scott ... 82
Sievers ... 94
Sjöberg ... 32
Smith ... 14 f., 93
Steuernagel ... 22, 29
Strack-Billerbeck ... 38
Szuster ... 42 f., 44 f., 47, 55
Säve-Söderbergh ... 63, 65, 75
Tallqvist ... 35, 87
Tedesco ... 57
Thompson ... 16
Troje ... 70
Wachsmuth ... 82
Waitz ... 49
Waterman ... 87 f.
Weber ... 47, 72
Weir ... 10, 16, 53, 86, 88
Welch ... 30
Wensinck ... 23
Widengren 9, 19 f., 25 f., 32 f., 34 f., 36, 40, 46 f., 53 f., 61, 63 f., 65, 69, 71 f., 76
Wikander ... 70
Witzel ... 10, 86 f., 91
Wright ... 23, 52, 54
Zahn ... 56
Zimmern ... 8, 17
Östborn ... 11, 25, 27

Bibliography.

Albright, W. F., Archæology and the Religion of Israel. Baltimore 1946.

——, The Conquests of Nabonidus in Arabia. (*JRAS* 1925 pp. 293—95.)

Allberry, C. R. C. A., A Manichæan Psalmbook, Part 2. Stuttgart 1938. (Manichæan Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection.)

Andræ, T., Die Person Muhammeds in Lehre und Glauben seiner Gemeinde. Stockholm 1918. (Archives d'études orientales, 16.)

Andreas, F. C., & Henning, W. B., Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan. I—III. Berlin 1932—34.

Baentsch, B., Exodus-Leviticus-Numeri. Göttingen 1903. (*HAT* I 2.)

Bartholomæ, Chr., Altiranisches Wörterbuch. Strassburg 1904.

Barton, G. A., The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad. New Haven 1929. (*RISA.*)

Bedjan, P., Acta martyrum et sanctorum. 3. Paris 1892.

Beer, G., Exodus. Tübingen 1939. (*HbzAT* I 3.)

Bentzen, Aa., Det sakrale Kongedömme. Köbenhavn 1945.

Bernard, J. H., The Odes of Solomon. Cambridge 1912. (*Ta S* VII 3.)

Berthelot, M., Collection des alchimistes grecs. Avec la collaboration de Ch. Ém. Ruelle. 1—4. Paris 1887—88.

Bertholet, A., Hesekiel. Tübingen 1936. (*HbzAT* I 13.)

Bevan, A. A., The Hymn of the Soul contained in the Syriac Acts of St. Thomas. Cambridge 1897. (*TA S* V 3.)

Bezold, C., Die Schatzhöhle. 1—2. Leipzig 1883—88.

——, & Budge, E. A. W., The Tell El-Amarna Tablets in the British Museum. London 1892.

Blochet, E., Études sur le gnosticisme musulman. (*RSO* II/1908—09 pp. 717—56; III/1910 pp. 177—203; IV/1911—12 pp. 47—79, 267—300; VI/1913 pp. 5—67.)

Boll, Fr., Aus der Offenbarung Johannis. Leipzig & Berlin 1914. (Stoiχeia 1.)

Bonwetsch, G. N., Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs. Das sogenannte slavische Henochbuch. Leipzig 1922. (*TU* 44: 2.)

Bornkamm, G., Mythos und Legende in den apokryphen Thomas-Akten. Göttingen 1933. (*FRLANT* N. F. 31.)

Bousset, W., Die Himmelsreise der Seele. (*ARW* IV/1901 pp. 136—169, 229—273.)

——, Die Offenbarung Johannis. Göttingen 1906. (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament begründet von Heinr. Aug. Wilh. Meyer.)

Bousset, W., Die Religion des Judentums. 3. Aufl. hrsg. von H. Gressmann. Tübingen 1926. (*HbzNT* 21.)
Brandt, W., Die mandäische Religion, ihre Entwicklung und geschichtliche Bedeutung erforscht, dargestellt und beleuchtet. Leipzig 1889.
——, Das Schicksal der Seele nach dem Tode nach den mandäischen und parsischen Vorstellungen. (Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie XVIII/1892 pp. 404 ff., 575 ff.)
——, Elchasai, ein Religionsstifter und sein Werk. Leipzig 1912.
——, Die Mandäer. Ihre Religion und ihre Geschichte. Amsterdam 1915. (*VKAWA* 16: 3.)
Budge, E. A. W., The Book of the Cave of Treasures. London 1927.
Buhl, F., Das Leben Muhammeds. Deutsch von H. H. Schader. Leipzig 1930.
Bultmann, R., Das Evangelium des Johannes. Göttingen 1941. (Neudruck 1950.) (Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament begründet von Heinr. Aug. Wilh. Meyer.)
Burney, C. F., The Book of Judges. 2nd ed. London 1920.
Buttenwieser, M., Outline of the Neo-Hebraic Apocalyptic Literature. Cincinnati 1901.
Böhl, F. M. T., Der babylonische Fürstenspiegel. Leipzig 1937. (*MAOG* 11: 3.)
——, Oud-Babylonische Mythen. (*JEOL* 1—5/1938 pp. 194—204.)
Cerfaux, L., La gnose Simonienne. (*RSR* 16/1925 pp. 265—285, 481—503.)
——, Le vrai prophète des Clémentines. (*RSR* 18/1928 pp. 143—163.)
Charles, R. H. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs Translated. London 1908.
——, The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. Translated from the editor's Ethiopic text. Oxford 1912.
——, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Oxford 1929.
Chiera, E., Sumerian Epics and Myths. Chicago 1934. (*OIP* XV.)
Chwolsohn, D., Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus. I—II. St. Petersburg 1856.
Clay, A. T., Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection. New Haven 1915. (Yale Oriental Series. Babylonian Texts 1.)
Clemen, C., Die Himmelfahrt des Mose. Hrsg. Bonn 1924. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen, 10.)
Connolly, R. H., The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai. Cambridge 1916. (*Ta S* VIII: 1.)
Cowley, A. E., The Samaritan Liturgy. I—II. Oxford 1909.
Craig, J. A. Assyrian and Babylonian Religious Texts etc. Copied from the Original Tablets Preserved in the British Museum and Auto-graphed. 1—2. Leipzig 1895—97. (*AB* 13.)

Cullmann, O., Le problème littéraire et historique du roman pseudo-clémentin. Thèse. Paris 1930.
Cumont, F., Recherches sur le manichéisme. I. Paris 1908.
Cureton, W., Šahrastānī, Book of Religious and Philosophical Sects. Ed. London 1846. Reprint Leipzig 1923.
Curtis, E. L. & Madsen, A. A., A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles. Edinburgh 1910. (*ICC.*)
Dalman, G., Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch. 2 Aufl. Leipzig 1905.
De Faye, E., Gnostiques et Gnosticisme. 2e éd. Paris 1925.
Deimel, A., Šumerisches Lexicon 1—3. 1 ed. Rome 1925—37.
——, Akkadisch-Šumerisches Glossar. Rom 1937.
——, Šumerische Grammatik. 2. Aufl. Roma 1939. (Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici.)
Delitzsch, Fr., Assyrische Studien. H. 1. Leipzig 1874.
——, Assyrian Grammar. Transl. by R. S. Kennedy. Leipzig 1889.
——, Assyrisches Handwörterbuch. Leipzig 1896. (*HW.*)
Dhorme, P. (E.), Choix de textes religieux assyro-babyloniens. Paris 1907. (Études bibliques.)
——, La religion assyro-babylonienne. Paris 1910.
——, Les religions de Babylonie et d'Assyrie. Paris 1945. (*Mana 1.*)
Dhorme, E. (P.)., Prêtres, devins et mages dans l'ancienne religions des hébreux. (*RHR* T. CVIII/1933 pp. 111—143.)
Diettrich, G., Die nestorianische Taufliturgie. Übers. Giessen 1903.
Driver, G. R., Some Hebrew Roots and their Meanings. (*JThS* XXIII/1922 pp. 69—73.)
——, Studies in the Vocabulary of the Old Testament. III. (*JThS* XXXII/1931 pp. 361—366.)
Dürr, L., Ezekiels Vision von der Erscheinung Gottes im Lichte der vorderasiatischen Altertumskunde. Münster 1917.
Ebeling, E., Ebabbara. (*RLA* II p. 263.)
Edsman, C.-M., Le baptême de feu. (Diss.) Uppsala 1940. (Acta Seminarii Neotest. Ups. IX.)
Engnell, I., Israel and the Law. A Review Article. Uppsala 1946. (Symbolae Biblicæ Upsalienses. 7.)
Falkenstein, A., Sumerische religiöse Texte. 1. Drei 'Hymnen' auf Urninurta von Isin. (*ZA* N. F. 15/1949 pp. 80—150.)
——, Ein sumerisches Kultlied auf Samsu'iluna. (Archiv Orientalni XVII 7/1949 pp. 212—26.)
Fascher, E.. Προφήτης. Giessen 1927.
Festugière, J., La révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste. I. L'astrologie et les sciences occultes. Paris 1944. (Études bibliques.)
Frankenberg, W., Die Syrischen Clementinen mit griechischem Paralleltext. Leipzig 1937. (*TU* R. 4 Bd. 3: 3.)
Frankfort, H., Jacobsen, Th. & Preusser, C., Tell Asmar and Khafaje. The First Season's Work in Eshnunna, 1930/31. Chicago 1932. (*OIC* 13.)

Frankfort, H., Cylinder Seals. London 1939.
——, Lloyd, S., & Jacobsen, Th., The Gimilsin Temple and The Palace of the Rulers at Tell Asmara. Chicago 1940. (*OIP* 43.)
Friedrich, J., Churritische Märchen und Sagen in hethitischer Sprache. (*ZA* N. F. 15/1949 pp. 213—55.)
Gadd, C. J., A Sumerian Reading-Book. Oxford 1924.
Gaster, M., Hebrew Visions of Hell and Paradise. (*JRAS* 1893 pp. 571—611.)
Geller, S., Die sumerisch-assyrische Serie LUGAL-É UD ME-LAM-BI NIR-GÁL. Leiden 1917. (*AOTU T* 4.)
Gesenius, W., De Samaritanorum Theologia ex fontibus ineditio commentatio. Halle 1823.
——, Carmina Samaritana e codicibus Londinensibus et Gothanis. Leipzig 1824. (Anecdota orientalia, fasc. 1.)
Gesenius, W., & Buhl, F., Hebräisches und Aramäisches Wörterbuch über das Alte Testament. 17. Aufl. Leipzig 1921. (*HW*.)
Gesenius, W., & Kautzsch, E., Hebrew Grammar, Second English Edition by A. E. Cowley. Oxford 1910.
Gordon, C., Ugaritic Handbook. Revised Grammar, Paradigms, Texts in Transliteration, Comprehensive Glossary. Roma 1947. (*AnO* 25.)
Gray, G. Buchanan, Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Oxford 1925.
Gressmann, H., Mose und seine Zeit. Göttingen 1913. (*FRLANT* N. F. 1.)
——, Jüdisch-Aramäisches bei Epiphanius. (*ZNW* 16/1915 pp. 191—197.)
Haarbrücker, Th., Abu-'l-Fath' Muh'ammad asch-Schahrastâni's Religionspartheien und Philosophen-Schulen. Übers. I—II. Halle 1850—51.
Haldar, A., Associations of Cult-Prophets among the Ancient Semites. (Diss.) Uppsala 1945.
——, Studies in the Book of Nahum. Uppsala 1946. (*UUÅ* 1946:7.)
Harper, E. T., Die babylonischen Legenden von Etana, Zu, Adapa und Dibbarra. (*BA* II 2 pp. 390—521.)
Harper, R. F., Assyrian and Babylonian Letters Belonging to the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum. 1—14. Chicago & London 1892—1914.
Harris, Z. S., A Grammar of the Phoenician Language. New Haven 1936. (*AOS* 8.)
Haupt, P., Toy, C. H., The Book of Ezekiel in Hebrew. Leipzig 1899, p. 85. (*SBOT* 12.)
Hausherr, I., Jean le Solitaire. (Pseudo-Jean de Lycopolis.) Dialogue sur l'âme et les passions des hommes. Roma 1939. (*OCA* 120.)
——, Un grand auteur spirituel retrondé: Jean d'Apamée. (*OCP* XIV/1948 pp. 3—42.)
Heidel, A., The Babylonian Genesis. Chicago 1942.
Heidenheim, M., Bibliotheca Samaritana. I—II. Leipzig 1884—85. III. Weimar 1896.

Henning, W. B., The Book of the Giants. (*BSOAS* XI 1/1943 pp. 52—74.)
——, Two Central Asian Words. (Transactions of the Philological Society 1945 pp. 150—162.)
Herzfeld, E., Paikuli. Berlin 1924.
Hilgenfeld, A., Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums. Leipzig 1884.
Hooke, S. H., The Labyrinth. Ed. S. H. Hooke. London & New York 1935.
Horn, P., Grundriss der neupersischen Etymologie. Strassburg 1893. (Sammlung indogermanischer Wörterbücher IV.)
——, Neupersische Schriftsprache. Strassburg 1898—1901. (*GrIrPh* I 2.)
Hyatt, J. Ph., The Treatment of Final Vowels in Early Neo-Babylonian. New Haven 1941. (Yale Or. Ser. Researches. Vol. XXIII.)
Hübschmann, H., Armenische Grammatik. I. Theil. Armenische Etymologie. Leipzig 1897. (Bibliothek indogermanischer Grammatiken. Band VI.)
Hölscher, G., Levi. (*PW* 12: 2/1925 cols. 2155—2208.)
Illustrated London News. 6/5 1950.
James, E. O., Christian Myth and Ritual; a Historic Study. London 1933.
Jensen, P., Die Kosmologie der Babylonier. Strassburg 1890.
——, Assyrisch-Babylonische Mythen und Epen. (*KB* VI 1.) Berlin 1900.
Jeremias, J., Der Gottesberg. Gütersloh 1919.
Jestin, R., Textes religieux sumériens. (*RA* 40/1945—46 pp. 49—54.)
Johnson, A. R., The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel. Cardiff 1944.
Jonas, H., Gnosis und spätantiker Geist. Göttingen 1934. (*FRLANT* N. F. 33.)
Kaplan, Ch., The Hidden Name. (*JSOR* XIII/1929 pp. 181—84.)
Kramer, S. N., Sumerian Literature. (Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. 85/1942 pp. 293—323.)
——, The Epic of Gilgameš and its Sumerian Sources. (*JAOS* 64/1944 pp. 7—23.)
——, Sumerian Mythology. Philadelphia 1944. (Memoirs of The American Philosophical Society Vol. XXI.)
Kraus, P., Altbabylonische Briefe. 1—2. Leipzig 1931—32 (*MVAEG* 35: 2; 36: 1.)
Kroll, J., Gott und Hölle. Der Mythos vom Descensuskampfe. Leipzig & Berlin 1932. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg XX.)
Labat, R., Le poème babylonien de la création. Paris 1935.
——, Le caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne. Paris 1939. (Études d'assyriologie 2.)
Lamy, T. J., Sancti Ephraemi Syri Hymni et Sermones. I—IV. Mechliniæ 1882—1902.
Landsberger, B., Schwierige akkadische Wörter. 1. parṣu. (Archiv für Keilschriftforschung II pp. 64—68.)

Landsberger, B., & Bauer, Th., Zu neuveröffentlichten Geschichtsquellen aus der Zeit von Asarhaddon bis Nabonid. *ZA.* 37/1926—27 pp. 61—98.
Lippert, J., Ibn al-Ḳifṭī, Ta'rīḫ al ḥukamā'. Ed. Leipzig 1903.
Langdon, S., Die neubabylonischen Königsinschriften. Übers. von R. Zehnpfund. Leipzig 1912. (*VAB* 4.)
——, Babylonian Liturgies. Paris 1913.
——, Sumerian Liturgical Texts. Philadelphia 1917. (*UMBS* 10: 2.)
——, The Babylonian Epic of Creation. Oxford 1923.
——, The H. Weld-Blundell Collection in the Ashmolean Museum. Vol. I. Oxford 1923. (*OECI* I.)
Layard, A. H., Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments. London 1851.
Legge, F., Philosophumena or the Refutation of all Heresies. Transl. 1—2. London 1921.
Leisegang, H., Die Gnosis. Leipzig 1924.
Lidzbarski, M., Das Johannesbuch der Mandäer. 1—2. Giessen 1905—15.
——, Mandäische Liturgien. Berlin 1920.
——, Verschiedenes. (*ZS* 2/1924 pp. 179—183.)
——, Ginzā der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer, Göttingen & Leipzig 1925.
Lods, A., Israël des origines au milieu du VIII[e] siècle. Paris 1932. (L'évolution de l'humanité.)
Lohmeyer, E., Die Offenbarung des Johannes. Tübingen 1926. (*HbzNT* 16.)
Luckenbill, D. D., The Annals of Sennacherib. Chicago 1924.
Massignon, L., Inventaire de la littérature hermétique arabe. (Festugière, La révélation d'Hermes Trismégiste pp. 384—400.)
Meier, G., Die assyrische Beschwörungssammlung Maqlû neu bearbeitet. (*AfO* Beih. 2/1937.)
Meissner, B., Babylonien und Assyrien. 1—2. Heidelberg 1920—25. (Kulturgeschichtliche Bibliothek R. 1: 3—4.)
Montgomery, J. A., The Samaritans. Philadelphia 1907.
——, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Edinburgh 1927. (*ICC.*)
——, The Samaritans. Philadelphia 1907.
Mowinckel, S., Psalmenstudien. 1—6. Kristiania 1921—24. (Videnskabsselskabets skrifter, Hist. filos. Kl. 1921: 4, 6; 1922: 1, 2; 1923: 3; 1924: 1.)
Murmelstein, B., Adam, ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre. (*WZKM* XXXV/1928 pp. 242—275; XXXVI/1929 pp. 51—86.)
Museum Journal, Philadelphia 1920.
Muss-Arnolt, W., Assyrisch-Englisch-Deutsches Handwörterbuch 1—2. Berlin 1894—1905.
Noth, M., Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien. I. Halle 1943. (*SKGG* 18: 2.)

Nyberg, H. S., Studien zum Hoseabuche. Uppsala 1935. (*UUÅ* 1935: 6.)
——, Studien zum Religionskampf im Alten Testament. (*ARW* XXXV/1938 pp. 329—87.)
——, Die Religionen des alten Iran. Leipzig 1938. (*MVAEG* 43.)
Nöldeke, Th., Mandäische Grammatik. Halle 1875.
Pallis, S. Aa., The Babylonian Akitu Festival. Köbenhavn 1926. (Hist. filol. Medd. f. d. Kgl. Danske Vid.-Selsk. 12: 1.)
Pandnāmak. (Nyberg, H. S., Hilfsbuch des Pehlevi. I. Uppsala 1928, pp. 17—30.)
Pedersen, J., Israel. Its Life and Culture. III—IV. London & Copenhagen 1940.
Pedersen, V. Schou, Bidrag til analyse af de mandæiske skrifter. (Diss.) Aarhus 1940.
Petermann, H., Thesaurus s. Liber magnus vulgo „Liber Adami" appellatus opus Mandæorum summi ponderis. Ed. H. Petermann. Leipzig 1967.
Plessner, M., Neue Materialien zur Geschichte der Tabula Smaragdina. (*DI* XVI/1927 pp. 77—113.)
Pognon, H., Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir. Paris 1898—99.
Ravn, O. E., Babyloniske og Assyriske kongers historiske indskrifter. Köbenhavn 1934.
Rawlinsson, H. C., The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia. 4. Second edition. London 1891.
Reitzenstein, R., Das mandäische Buch des Herrn der Grösse. Heidelberg 1919. (*SBHAW* 12.)
——, Alchemistische Lehrschriften und Märchen bei den Arabern. Giessen 1923. (*RVV* XIX 2.)
——, Die Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe. Leipzig & Berlin 1929.
——, & Schæder, H. H., Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland. Leipzig & Berlin 1926. (Studien der Bibliothek Warburg VII.)
Renan, E., Fragments du Livre gnostique intitulé: Apocalypse d'Adam. Publ. (*JA* Sér. V 2/1853 pp. 427—71.)
Riesenfeld, H., Jésus transfiguré. (Diss.) Köbenhavn 1947. (Acta Seminarii Neotest. Ups. XVI.)
Rignell, G., Briefe von Johannes dem Einsiedler. (Diss.) Lund 1941.
Ritter, H., Al-Naubaḫtī, Kitāb firaḳ al-šīʿah. Istanbul 1931. (Bibliotheca Islamica 4.)
Rowley, H. H., Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor Theodore H. Robinson. Ed. by H. H. Rowley. Edinburgh 1950.
Ruska, J., Arabische Alchemisten. I. Chālid ibn Jazīd ibn Muʿāwija. Heidelberg 1924. (Heidelberger Akten der von-Portheim-Stiftung 6.)

Ruska, J., Tabula Smaragdina. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der hermetischen Literatur. Heidelberg 1926. (Heidelberger Akten der von-Portheim-Stiftung 16.)

Scheil, V., Notes sur quelques textes de Drehem. (*RA* 17/1920 pp. 207—13.)

——, Fragments de la légende du dieu Zû. (*RA* 35/1938 pp. 14—25.)

Schnabel, P., Berossos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur. Leipzig & Berlin 1923.

Schollmeyer, A., Sumerisch-Babylonische Hymnen und Gebete an Šamaš. Paderborn 1912. (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums Erg.-Bd. 1.)

Schott, A., Akkad *šu*/*ahuru*, *nam*^{a}/*ēru* und *parakku*. (*ZA* N. F. 6/1931 pp. 1—28.)

Schwab, M., Le Talmud de Jérusalem. Trad. Paris 1878—90.

Scott, W., Hermetica. The Ancient Greek and Latin Writings . . . ascribed to Hermes Trismegistos. Ed. with English Translation and Notes. I—IV. Oxford 1924—29.

Sjöberg, E., Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch. Lund 1946. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. XLI.)

Smith, S., Babylonian Historical Texts Relating to the Capture and Downfall of Babylon. London 1924.

——, Isaiah Chapters XL—LV: Literary Criticism and History. London 1944. (Schweich Lectures, 1940.)

Steuernagel, C., Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Tübingen 1912. (Sammlung theologischer Lehrbücher.)

Strack, H. L., & Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. T. 1—4. München 1922—28.

Suffrin, A. E., Fate (Jewish). (*ERE* Vol. V cols. 793 a—794 a.)

Szuster, I., Marqa-Hymnen aus der samaritanischen Liturgie. (Diss.) Bonn 1936.

Säve-Söderbergh, T., Studies in the Coptic Manichæan Psalm-Book. Uppsala 1949. (Arbeten utgivna med understöd av Vilhelm Ekmans universitetsfond, Uppsala, 55.)

Tallqvist, K., Die assyrische Beschwörungsserie Maqlû. Helsingfors 1895. (Acta Societ. Scient. Fennicæ XX: 6.)

——, Akkadische Götterepitheta. Helsingfors 1938. (Studia Orientalia VII.)

Tedesco, P., Dialektologie der westiranischen Turfantexte. (*MO* XV/1921 pp. 184—258.)

Thomas, J., Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie. (Diss.) Gembloux 1935. (Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes . . . Series II. — Tomus 28.)

Thompson, R. Campbell, The Prisms of Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal Found at Nineveh 1927—28. London 1931.

——, A Dictionary of Assyrian Chemistry and Geology. Oxford 1936.

Thureau-Dangin, F., L'exaltation d'Ištar. (*RA* 11/1914 pp. 141—158.)
Ungnad, A., Neubabylonische Rechts- und Verwaltungsurkunden. Beiheft zu Band I: Glossar. Leipzig 1937.
——, Grammatik des Akkadischen. München 1949. (Clavis linguarum Semiticarum, P. 2.)
Wachsmuth, C., Joannis Stobaei Anthologii libri duo priores. I—II. Berlin 1884.
Waitz, H., Die Pseudoklementinen. Leipzig 1904. (*TU* N. F. X 4.)
Waterman, L., The Royal correspondence of the Assyrian Empire. 1—4. Ann Arbor 1930—36. (University of Michigan Studies, Hum. Ser. 17—20.)
Weber, F., Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften. 2. Aufl. Leipzig 1897.
Weir, C. J. M., A Lexicon of Accadian Prayers. London 1934.
Weissbach, F. H., Enmeduranki. (*RLA* II p. 394 f.)
Welch, A. C., The Work of the Chronicler. London 1939. (The Schweich Lectures 1938.)
Wensinck, A. J., The Navel of the Earth. Amsterdam 1916. (*VKAWA* 17: 1.)
——, Tree and Bird as Cosmological Symbols in Western Asia. Amsterdam 1921. (*VKAWA* 22: 1.)
Widengren, G., The Accadian and Hebrew Psalms of Lamentation as Religious Documents. Stockholm 1937.
——, Psalm 110 och det sakrala kungadömet i Israel. Uppsala 1941. (*UUÅ* 1941: 7: 1.)
——, Det sakrala kungadömet bland öst- och västsemiter. (*RoB* II/1943 pp. 49—75.)
——, Religionens värld. Stockholm 1945.
——, The Great Vohu Manah and the Apostle of God. Uppsala 1945. (*UUÅ* 1945: 5.)
——, Den himmelska intronisationen och dopet. (*RoB* V/1946 pp. 28—61.)
——, Mesopotamian Elements in Manichæism. (King and Saviour II.) Uppsala 1946. (*UUÅ* 1946: 3.)
——, Till det sakrala kungadömets historia i Israel. Stockholm 1947. (*HS* I 3.)
——, Literary and Psychological Aspects of the Hebrew Prophets. Uppsala 1948. (*UUÅ* 1948: 10.)
——, Hieros gamos och underjordsvistelse. (*RoB* VII/1948 pp. 17—46.)
——, Konung och Frälsare. (*Ms.*)
Wikander, S., Notes irano—arméniennes. (*MO* XXXVI/1946 pp. 1—8 of the offprint.)
Witzel, M., Was bedeutet *parṣu*. (*MVAG* 21/1916 pp. 199—212.)
——, Keilinschriftliche Studien. 1—7. Fulda 1918—30.
——, Zu VAT 8240 = KAR I Nr. 38. (*Or* 2/1933 pp. 208—23.)
——, Tammuz-Liturgien und Verwandtes. Roma 1935. (*AnO* 10.)
——, Auswahl sumerischer Dichtungen I. Roma 1938. (*AnO* 15.)

Wright, W., Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles. 1—2. London 1871.
——, A Grammar of the Arabic Language. Third Edition by W. Robertson Smith & M. J. de Goeje. 1—2. Cambridge 1933.
Zimmern, H., Beiträge zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion. Die Beschwörungstafeln Šurpu, Ritualtafeln für den Wahrsager, Beschwörer und Sänger. Leipzig 1896—1901. (*AB* 12.)
——, Sumerische Kultlieder aus babylonischer Zeit. 1—2. Berlin 1912—13.
——, König Lipit-Ištar's Vergöttlichung. Leipzig 1916. (*BSGW* 68:5.)
Östborn, G., Tōrā in the Old Testament. (Diss.) Lund 1945.

DATE DUE

DEC 16			

HIGHSMITH # 45220

BT 1405 .W5

Widengren, Geo, 1907-

The ascension of the apostle
and the heavenly book

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
NEW YORK

GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
00007810
T5-CRO-014